

**VANDALISM
AND OUTDOOR RECREATION:
symposium proceedings**

**PACIFIC
SOUTHWEST
Forest and Range
Experiment Station**

FOREST SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
P.O. BOX 245, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94701

USDA FOREST SERVICE
GENERAL TECHNICAL
REPORT PSW-17 / 1976



Alfano, Sam S., and Arthur W. Magill, technical coordinators.

1976. **Vandalism and outdoor recreation: symposium proceedings.** USDA Forest Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-17, 72 p., illus. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Berkeley, Calif.

Resource managers, law enforcement officers, designers, and social scientists provide 24 papers giving an overview of vandalism on outdoor recreation areas; a measure of the difficult control problems which must be solved; some insights for design of buildings, fixtures, and site layouts to reduce or repel vandalism; and a profile of vandals, with respect to the potential for reducing their activities through understanding of social-psychological factors. Recommendations prepared by panelists and symposium participants summarize the views presented and suggest measures for control of vandalism on outdoor recreation areas.

Oxford: 907.2:U343.22.

Retrieval Terms: outdoor recreation areas; vandalism; law enforcement; design; social factors.

Technical Coordinators

SAM S. ALFANO is recreation staff officer, Los Padres National Forest. He earned a bachelor of science degree in forestry in 1954 at Utah State University. His work in outdoor recreation began on the Angeles National Forest in 1957 and he also served on the Sequoia and San Bernardino National Forests before his assignment to Los Padres in 1966. **ARTHUR W. MAGILL** is principal resource analyst in the Station's Land Use and Landscape Planning Methodology Research Work Unit, assigned to study of resource impacts, human behavior, landscape analysis, and urban forestry. He holds degrees in forestry from the University of Washington (bachelor of science, 1957) and the University of California, Berkeley (master of science, 1963). He joined the Station staff in 1957.

VANDALISM AND OUTDOOR RECREATION: symposium proceedings

Sam S. Alfano Arthur W. Magill
Technical Coordinators

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	1
Recommendations	3
The View from the Field	
Vandalism--An Overview. <i>George A. Kenline</i>	6
Vandalism on the Santa Lucia District <i>John Blake</i>	9
Vandalism on the Mt. Pinos District <i>James Hunter</i>	10
Vandalism in Desert Areas <i>Mike Wintch</i>	11
Vandalism in the Channel Islands National Monument. <i>Ronald W. Sutton</i>	12
Vandalism in California State Parks <i>Thomas Miller</i>	14
Vandalism in a City Park. <i>Richard Samp</i>	15
Vandalism in Organized Camps in California. <i>Patrick C. Dickson</i>	17
Law Enforcement	
Vandalism and Law Enforcement on National Forest Lands. <i>Thomas A. Hoots</i>	20
Vandalism: The California State Park Approach. <i>Jerry Morrison</i>	23

	<i>Page</i>
Vandalism at "Red Rock"	25
<i>John C. Einolander</i>	
Law Enforcement and Vandalism in Our National Parks	27
<i>Nicholas Whelan</i>	
A Magistrate's View of Vandalism.	29
<i>Willard W. McEwen</i>	
Creative Justice.	30
<i>Glenn Hampton</i>	
 Design and Vandalism	
The Designer as the Vandal.	34
<i>Michael Morrissey</i>	
Control of Vandalism--An Architectural Design Approach.	35
<i>John Grosvenor</i>	
Design of Campground Facilities	37
<i>Briar Cook</i>	
Design vs. Vandalism.	39
<i>Arthur C. Danielian</i>	
Preventive Planning to Reduce Vandalism	42
<i>H. Ernest Reynolds</i>	
 Sociology of Vandalism	
Vandals Aren't All Bad.	46
<i>Michael L. Williams</i>	
The Message of Vandalism.	50
<i>Arthur W. Magill</i>	
A Psychoanalytic View of Vandalism.	54
<i>Robert J. Sokol</i>	
Vandalistic Forest Fire Setting	58
<i>William S. Folkman</i>	
Control of Vandalism in Recreation Areas--Fact, Fiction, or Folklore?	62
<i>Roger N. Clark</i>	

PREFACE

Vandalism is taking an increasingly big bite out of the funds needed for protection and maintenance of recreation facilities in southern California. The problem is not limited to the southern portion of the State or even to California as a whole--it exists nationwide. In 1974, \$1.5 million was spent to correct vandalous damage and littering on the 17 National Forests in California, but \$7.5 million was the cost to the entire National Forest System. Agencies other than the Forest Service are also paying the cost of vandalism. The California Department of Parks and Recreation reported \$87,000 worth of damage in 1975, but because considerable vandalism goes unreported, actual annual costs have been estimated as high as \$180,000. The U. S. Bureau of Land Management has estimated damage as high as \$250,000 per year; although that is much lower than the Forest Service's costs, the Bureau has fewer facilities and they are more widely distributed. In general, vandalism is increasing for municipal, State, and Federal agencies as well as for private landholding companies.

Resource managers throughout the nation are searching for the meaning behind vandalous acts, hoping that through reason and understanding, they can find ways to stop the seemingly endless destruction, theft, and littering. The Outdoor Recreation Vandalism Symposium, held March 26-27, 1976 at Santa Barbara, California sponsored by the Los Padres National Forest of the Forest Service and the Southern California Section of the Society of American Foresters, represents a step toward an organized, interdisciplinary approach to the search for solutions. The symposium has drawn upon the expertise of foresters, sociologists, criminologists, architects, park planners, psychologists, landscape architects, and recreation technicians to define the impact of vandalism on (1) the physical resource and the user public, (2) the problems of law enforcement, (3) the opportunities for control through facility and site design, and (4) the socio-psychological profile of vandals and the potential for social control.

The "man-on-the-ground," the recreation resource manager, daily faces the consequences of vandalism. He usually regards acts of vandalism as "senseless" or "wanton" and cannot understand why some people deface or destroy facilities provided to give them pleasure. In this collection of papers, several "men-on-the-ground" offer their views of the

destruction wrought by "phantom" vandals and of "types" of vandalous acts. Vandalism is variously described as littering; disturbing the peace; damaging or destroying vehicles, buildings, or other property; starting wild-fires; chopping down or mutilating trees and shrubs; theft; and defacing objects with graffiti. Managers have tallied the costs of vandalism, and they have been innovative in dealing with the problems, but they admit to a lack of sound solutions that are generally applicable. They are seeking assistance in effective control of vandals.

Resource managers work closely with law enforcement officers. Unfortunately, catching a vandal is not simple, for all too often, the act is unobserved and the vandal is gone before an officer arrives. Several resource managers, a law enforcement officer, and a magistrate have expressed, in these proceedings, their frustration in dealing with vandals. Some officers suggest stronger police control and others suggest avoiding a "hard approach to law enforcement. Some agencies have trained resource managers to be law enforcement officers, whereas other agencies do not want managers to assume the responsibility. The obviously conflicting viewpoints strongly suggest the need for greater understanding and more uniformly applicable approaches to law enforcement.

Architects, landscape architects, and engineers are faced with the dilemma of designing sites, buildings, and facilities that are vandal-proof yet attractive and serviceable enough to not invite vandalism--more desirably, that are so "in tune" with human needs that vandalous acts do not happen.

The sociologist-psychologist perceives vandalism as a social problem that is symptomatic of society's failure to provide for the basic human needs of a segment of the public. Unfortunately, no universal answers are available now or likely to be. Understanding of the diversity of individual motivation--of both the vandal and the manager--is a necessary step toward discovery of diverse solutions.

By summarizing the papers of the panels in each problem area, and securing audience interaction, we have developed a number of recommendations.

We hope that resource managers and others will try to follow the recommendations.

Furthermore, we hope they will record and report successes or failures, thus giving some measure of the results of the symposium. Such feedback will help to determine the desirability of future meetings, and may also suggest additional research objectives.

This symposium on vandalism brought together representatives of the Forest

Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Society of American Foresters. Paul Rich, educational chairman, Southern California Section SAF, served as symposium co-chairman. The following National Forest public information officers served as panel moderators: Elliott Graham, San Bernardino; David A. Kimbrough, Angeles; Grover Payne, Cleveland; and Edward Waldapfel, Los Padres.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are currently no universally applicable solutions for vandalism. Develop solutions to meet the demands of specific locations and conditions.

Public Involvement and Planning

- Provide opportunities for the public to express their opinions and ideas about outdoor recreation planning. It may be important to involve users in the development and maintenance process.

- Do comprehensive site planning on the site, with input from site managers, designers, and law enforcement specialists. Use opinions and ideas from the public in the planning process.

Environmental Education

- Explain to visitors how various activities violate human rights or damage or destroy facilities and natural resources.

- Develop programs to show visitors how to use various recreational facilities and related natural resources in a manner that increases their enjoyment without damaging property and resources or violating the rights of others.

- Use schools and mass media to inform all levels of the public about proper and considerate uses of outdoor recreation areas. The success of educational programs is dependent on succinct messages that avoid professional jargon, on proper audience identification, and on selection of the best media or other conveyance to reach the desired audiences.

- Initiate news coverage by recreation personnel on items of public concern without relying on the news media to write the articles.

Manager Attitudes, Involvement, and Training

- Secure personal involvement of management personnel in solving the vandalism problem. It is essential for managers to realize that they may actually encourage vandalism through accepting poor site and facility design, providing recreational opportunities that are meaningless to users, or failing to understand and relate to the needs of users.

- Consider the full range of methods available to managers for reducing the entire problem of deviancy.

- Avoid rules that merely serve managers' convenience, and design, plan, and manage to satisfy the interests and needs of the user public.

- Develop and use training programs to indoctrinate full-time and part-time personnel in policy, law enforcement, and personal approaches to users.

- Set up a sound training program and an effective career ladder for outdoor recreation personnel.

Regulation, Cooperation, and Law Enforcement

- Establish and use a uniform code of regulations for all agencies in a coordinated effort to reduce vandalism.

- Set up annual review by law enforcement and resource agencies of their respective authorities and responsibilities to assure a clear understanding of their respective roles.

- Increase availability of law enforcement personnel while minimizing costs by utilizing the Sheriff's Reserve Deputy program. Reserves are volunteers who work with regular Sheriff's Deputies during weekends and other heavy workload periods.

Improve Agency Image

- Promote a favorable public service image by

- improving employee image of the agency (build stronger *esprit de corps*)

- explaining to visitors the reasons for agency actions

- providing complete outdoor recreation information at each recreation area

- maintaining a low profile but fair, firm, and impartial policy in law enforcement.

Court Actions

- Take law enforcement action on obvious violations.
- Make the names of convicted vandals and their punishment known through the media.
- Encourage courts and magistrates to sentence misdemeanor offenders to work on outdoor recreation areas.

Management Control Actions

- Reduce conflict between types of recreational activity (groups vs. single families, motorboats vs. sailboats, fishermen vs. water skiers, etc.) by assigning them to separate areas.
- Provide firewood at the campground whenever practical.
- Provide safe areas for target practice with firearms.
- Provide free interpretive materials at the site for the use and enjoyment of visitors.
- Provide evening campfire programs.
- Use signs that convey positive messages.
- Establish or continue the incentive litter control program to encourage positive campground behavior by both children and adults.

Controlling Access

- Issue permits or use a reservation system to identify individuals, families, or groups, thereby increasing control and making users accountable for their actions.
- Where possible, use entrance stations to control access to recreation sites.
- Charge an entrance fee for site maintenance or require a cleanup deposit, to be forfeited if users fail to leave a clean camp.
- Provide gates to control entry when a campground is full or after 10:00 p.m., but which permit departure in the event of an emergency.

Increase Visibility and Surveillance

- Design sites to be visible to patrolling officers.
- Increase the visual presence of

rangers, caretakers, or police by

scheduling work hours to coincide with peak use periods and times of greatest conflict

avoiding regular patterns of patrol

using the task force concept (3 or 4 officers at a time) to saturate problem areas.

- Use volunteer or other manpower programs to provide campground hosts (caretakers).

- Consider hiring a known vandal, who is respected by his group, to be a caretaker or patrolman.

Design

- Do not overdesign; less elaborate facilities would be adequate.

- Design toilet buildings to meet the needs of the user minimize vandalism.

- Design two-unit vault toilets with a minimum of 400 square inches of venting.

- Promote awareness by both producer and consumer that some manufactured products (motorcycles, jet skis, snowmobiles, hang gliders, etc.) are potentially destructive to the resource and annoying or intrusive to nonusers.

Research

- Continue research and testing of design concepts.

- Re-evaluate the role of private enterprise in building and operating recreational developments on public lands.

- Conduct practical, on-the-ground research on the diversity, intensity, causes, and potential controls of vandalism on outdoor recreation sites throughout southern California and if possible the entire southwest. The various agencies concerned should cooperate on research projects.

- Conduct research to help solve problems of dispersed recreation, particularly vandalism.

THE VIEW FROM THE FIELD



Vandalism---an Overview

George A. Kenline¹

In the Bronx Zoo, New York, there is a sign above a window that says, "See the most destructive animal alive!" People rush to the window to have a look. The window is equipped with a mirror. The experience is both revealing and condemning. Man has been and continues to be destructive in many ways. I would like to explore with you some of the ways man, woman, and child express themselves when using the mountain areas of southern California. These expressions of behavior will be labeled as acts of vandalism, that is, the illegal destruction or defacement of property belonging to someone else.

The mountains of Southern California are unique to millions of people who find them a welcome contrast to the blighted urban setting in which they live. The mountains are still a place where you can see green trees, rocks, blue sky, fresh water and stars at night. Most are located within 1 hour's travel of foothill communities and within 2 1/2 hours of the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Historically these mountains have sat as an island above a sea of desert, brushland, smog, noise, and congestion. But the late 1960's and early 1970's saw the character and quality of the mountain experience change. And the modern camper bears little resemblance to his forefather. He's well equipped, highly mobile, and leaves more than his footprints.

Assuming this is a representative group, let me ask you some questions. Do you throw your trash into your neighbor's yard? Do you clutter up his flower beds with empty beer cans and pop bottles? Do you litter his nice green lawn with used tissues, disposable baby diapers, newspapers, paper bags, and so forth? Do you chuck rocks, bottles, and inner tubes into his fish pond? It is most unlikely that you do. You doubtless have respect for his property and know that he would object to such behavior. Since you respect your neighbor's property and would not think of littering it with junk, do you have the same respect for public and private lands in the distant mountains? Apparently not everyone does, because

yearly, like a plague of locusts, careless visitors not only litter and trample, but worse still, deliberately destroy and deface those very natural features which they journey to see and enjoy.

Let us consider some of the forms and types of vandalism we in the field see recurring on a season-to-season if not a day-to-day basis. And for purposes of discussion, let's try to give them motive and meaning.

The first type of vandalism is done in the course of, or in order to, acquire money or property. This includes junking or stripping for resale, collecting souvenirs, and just plain looting.

A second type is damage done as a conscious tactic to advance some end. The end in mind might be to draw attention or gain publicity for a particular cause.

A third type uses property destruction as a form of revenge by someone who feels unfairly treated. This form of vandalism is much safer than punching the ranger in the nose.

A great amount of damage is carried out by preteenage children as part of their play activities. Many parents regard the campground as a place where children can play in a healthy environment. The dangers of the city are left behind; nothing can hurt the children, and there is nothing the children can hurt in return. The burdens of parental supervision can be traded for quiet hours of privacy as children run off to play by themselves. And the children are alone, much more so than in their own neighborhoods. The open street is replaced by screening woods. Watchful neighbors are exchanged for indifferent strangers dutifully following the rule of non-involvement that prevails in public places. Preadolescent children probably feel no sense of responsibility toward park facilities, and their predominantly urban upbringing provides few lessons in behavior appropriate to the natural environment. Under these circumstances, it is almost inevitable that damage will occur, motivated by curiosity and often by the spirit of competition.

The findings of a study done by Campbell, Hendee, and Clark in 1968 at a Pacific Northwest developed site are typical of our mountains. Here is their account:

¹ Recreation Assistant, Big Bear Ranger District, San Bernardino National Forest, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fawnskin, California.

Two boys... approximately 12 years of age, came to the campground accompanied by their mother and three younger siblings. Their father remained in the city and visited only on weekends, a fairly common arrangement. Upon arrival, the boys immediately left their mother, who was quite happy to be relieved of entertaining her two children. During the first two days in camp, the boys wrote obscenities on the wall of one washroom, plugged the toilets in a second, broke bottles in the beach area, chopped down a tree, tore down eight metal signs on the nature trail, and became lost overnight in the woods. Other than their overnight adventure, their activities went completely unobserved by other campers or campground personnel. One should not conclude, however, that these boys were naturally malicious. When one of the park rangers suggested they use part of their free time picking up trash and litter, they plunged into the activity with equal enthusiasm.

For destructive play, the old adage, "blame the parent, not the child," has more than a grain of truth. Considerable money could be saved each year if parents assumed greater responsibility for the activities of their children while in public parks.²

Much damage can be attributed to unthinking but well-intentioned adults. For example, campers sometimes solved the persistent problem of scarcity of firewood by theft from other campers or by cutting down a nearby tree, with no thought to the conservation implications of the act. Nails were hammered in trees to store camping equipment off the ground; cars and trailers were driven off parking pads and into vegetated areas for the sake of convenience; fires were built outside fireplaces by persons unaware of danger to timber-dry woods; trailer sanitary tanks were emptied in dumping stations clearly marked "closed" or "full" as people sought short-run solutions to their immediate problems. The point is that basically responsible but ill-informed and temporarily inconsiderate people create many problems in public parks.

The final type of vandalism we will con-

sider can't be explained any other way than to say it is malicious mischief in which persons or groups of persons combine hostility with fun. This type of vandalism is encouraged to a degree by our society. Events such as Halloween, fraternal initiations, semester breaks, and the aftermath of sporting events are examples. And the same kind of mentality accounts for what is known as "graffiti," the crude writing of names, slogans, obscenities, and vulgarisms on facilities or natural features. Graffiti differs from other forms of vandalism in that it is expected (for example in a public restroom). Lavatory attendants and caretakers of public buildings regard the cleaning of walls as part of their daily routine.

Why must a public toilet cost \$28,300? Simply because the ladies and gentlemen who use it often are not "ladies" and "gentlemen." You might say 'a comfortable one can be built for half the price.' True, but public restrooms must be vandalproof. We are forced to build them to withstand vandalism of the most senseless kind, and it costs more. Lavatories are of heavy cast iron, shower heads have tamper-proof bolts, lighting fixtures have double protection against breakage, showers are activated by buttons because shower handles would be torn off within a few days or perhaps before the building could be completed. The restroom is made of concrete block construction because some people have a habit of stripping lumber from wooden structures.

Vandalism is costly. But any figures are grossly understated: the cost of services and benefits foregone until facilities can be made operational again, of maintaining patrols and security forces, and of many other intangibles are seldom included. For example, vandals typically make public phones unusable. Besides the property damage, there is a toll in human tragedy here. A young girl died when her father was unable to summon a doctor from a public telephone damaged by vandals.

I'd like to share with you my first experience with vandalism as a public employee, and maybe shed some light on who does this sort of thing. On the Cleveland National Forest, along the old Highway 80, Ellis Wayside Rest is administered as a day-use facility by the Forest Service. The site is on a hillside covered with boulders festooned with graffiti. On a Sunday afternoon the Ranger, who had made up his mind to catch someone, went there and waited. It wasn't long before a car pulled up with a man and woman inside. The woman got out, opened the trunk, removed paint and brush, and headed for the rocks. After she painted her name on a large boulder, the Ranger intercepted her at the car. She was very embarrassed, and rightly so. She was a mature, well dressed, and well

² Campbell, Frederick L., John C. Hendee, and Roger Clark. 1968. Law and order in public parks. Parks and Rec. 3 (12) 28-31, 51-55, illus.

educated woman. Her husband, a Navy captain and ship's commander in San Diego, sitting in the driver's seat, was at a loss for words. Why had she done it?--she had always had the urge but never before the opportunity. This one experience points up the diverse backgrounds and ages of the so-called vandals.

What is behind it? Many explanations have been given. "All crime is up, everywhere, and this is just part of it," have said some authorities. Vandalism and Violence³, a special report developed by the staff of Education U.S.A., points to improper instruction and adult behavior as contributing factors: "The Boston Tea Party is often held up to students as a 'patriotic act,' a sort of punishment for the British in retaliation for an onerous tea tax. Yet what happened was pure vandalism perpetrated by grown men."

When taken together, the various reasons given seem to indicate that vandalism is often a protest. Stanford University Professor Philip G. Zimbardo⁴ explains: "Vandalism is rebellion with a cause." The cause, he says, is "social indifference, apathy, the loss of community, neighborhood and family values." It is true that practically everywhere young ones see loss of values--lying, cheating, and hypocrisy are rampant, even among world leaders. This breeds hostility in youngsters against "the establishment" and vandalism is one way they vent their feelings.

Indifferent, uncaring parents are perhaps the main cause of vandalism. And this abdication of responsibility by parents is noted in practically every community. As a result, rich, poor, middle class, and both black and white youngsters are all deeply involved in vandalism. A study of more than 3100 teenagers from "every major segment of the Illinois adolescent population" revealed that nearly one in every three had engaged in property destruction!

Wanton destruction by vandals is hurting property owners, increasing the cost of government, pushing up taxes and insurance rates, and adding hundreds of millions of dollars to the high cost of living in America. However, to

³ Wells, Elmer. 1971. Vandalism and violence: innovative strategies reduce cost to schools. Education U.S.A. Special Report. 59 p. Natl. Sch. Publ. Rel. Assoc., Washington, D.C.

⁴ Zimbardo, Philip G. 1973. A field experiment in autoshaping. In Vandalism. P. 85-90, illus. Colin Ward, ed. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.

highlight the law enforcement problems--consider the destruction of municipal property in New York, where there were more than 100,000 complaints of vandalism but only 3216 arrests were made. Many offenders get off with just a light reprimand.

The central reason for nonenforcement is one that applies to vandalism as a whole--the fact that this is one of the most safe and anonymous of offenses. There is no personal complaint, nor any property to carry or dispose of.

Consequently, detection rates are low and most damage is not thought worth bothering about. Although the total cost might be considerable, each individual act is too trivial to respond to in any other way than by ignoring it.

Employees complain, "I don't get it. We give them something free and they destroy it." A feeling of hopelessness has become general. Here's a typical feeling expressed by a recreation worker after reviewing four pages of notes on repairs needed in District developed sites. "It's nothing to get hysterical about. It's a housekeeping problem, a part of managing public facilities. One minute it upsets you, the next minute you think 'that's life.'"

We've looked at a number of examples of vandalism. Maybe we should try to draw some preliminary conclusions as one might do who works with the problem in the field.

1. The property destroyed is much more likely to be publicly than privately owned. This is due not just to the greater opportunities to attack public property, but also to its anonymous nature and symbolic value. The target is depersonalized and not easily identified with the idea "it belongs to them."

2. Some patterning in the physical characteristics of the target is also apparent: the property tends to be derelict, incomplete or badly kept. Again such property might be seen as fair game and not really belonging to anybody.

3. Areas of high vandalism can be distinguished by their social characteristics. Sites close in and within easy access to lower income groups receive more than their share of vandalism.

4. Studies of the social characteristics of the offender are important to counteract the image of homogeneity which assumes the existence of something like a "vandal type" responsible for all sorts of vandalism. Clearly no such personality type exists.

5. Groups of young people in late adolescence, enjoying the relatively inexpensive benefits of public facilities, are prone to participate in malicious, apparently senseless vandalism.

How can this rising tide of vandalism be stemmed? What is needed? Many efforts are being made to reverse the tide. Difficult-to-break plastic is replacing glass in windows. Hard-finish epoxy-resin paints that resist markings with felt-tip pens, lipstick, and crayons are being used on interior walls. New buildings are being built like fortresses, with few, if any, exterior windows. Alarms, fences, night lighting--all of these measures and more have been employed. Yet vandalism increases.

In the final analysis parents must be parents. They cannot slough the job onto someone else. And they very definitely do have an obligation to ...discipline.... Its chief value lies in strengthening the (personality) so that the adolescent can deal

adequately and independently with his inner drives and with outer pressures. It prevents the child from becoming a victim of anarchic impulses, narcissistic indulgence, and a false sense of omnipotence. The parent must employ this discipline in a manner that will lead to self discipline."

I would like to conclude by reading from an article in the San Bernardino Sun, titled "Vandalism may not be all bad." Federal officials here are poking holes in the theory that vandalism is all bad. They have found that bullet-riddled signs are stolen less often than unscarred ones. After losing four or five brand new off-road signs in as many months, Bureau of Land Management rangers decided early this year to punch holes in the signs before installation. "The signs with holes just don't look as good to thieves who want them for their wall at home. Before holes, the signs lasted about 10 days, since becoming holey they've stayed up to three months."

Vandalism on the Santa Lucia District

John Blake¹

The staff of the Santa Lucia District of the Los Padres National Forest would like to think that this District has a better forest user than some of the other Districts of Forests. Our vandalism problem has been small in the past, but it is increasing even though our District is quite isolated from large population centers. The nearest and largest towns are San Luis Obispo and Santa Maria, but both are relatively small. Three State highways and one interstate highway provide limited access to the District.

Despite generally average-type visitors, a favorable location, and limited access, our total costs due to vandalism came to \$4,213 during 1975. Litter and trash pick-up costs amounted to \$18,700. The predominant types of vandalism that we have experienced are: (1) shooting, (2) chopping, (3) graffiti, and (3) stealing. The extent to which public facilities can be damaged

is evident. Rifles, shotguns, and pellet guns have been used to riddle toilet-walls, garbage cans, signs, and even trees. People without guns have used rocks, sticks, axes, large hammers, and even vehicles to destroy buildings, tables, signs, and even gates made of heavy metal pipe. People have dumped litter and garbage on the ground, stolen tables, and used all types of wooden facilities for firewood. Obviously, wood structures are easily damaged, but we have also learned that fiberglass is a poor material for constructing campground fixtures.

The following measures may help to discourage vandalism in wildland areas:

1. Reward persons supplying information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons committing vandalous acts, by giving them the fines imposed against the guilty persons.
2. Require forest visitors to register before entering recreation sites.
3. Designate shooting areas for people to use. Cooperation with sportmen's clubs might

¹ Recreation Technician, Santa Lucia Ranger District, Los Padres National Forest, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Santa Maria, California.

contribute to successful establishment of shooting areas.

4. Permit senior citizens free use of campsites in return for watching the campground and maintaining the area. Full-time occupancy by responsible persons may discourage vandalous acts.

5. Establish positions for the handicapped and the senior citizen to act as a combination

caretaker-registrar for campgrounds.

6. Use Visitor Information Service techniques through public presentations to discourage vandalism.

7. Utilize the mass media (TV, radio and newspapers) to disseminate information to the public concerning vandalism and to campaign against it.

Vandalism on the Mt. Pinos District

James Hunter¹

The Mt. Pinos Ranger District is located 15 miles west of Interstate Highway 5, approximately 1 hour driving time from the fringe of the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The District includes nearly 500,000 acres of land which has extremes in topography, as well as weather. The elevation ranges from 3000 feet to 8831 feet at Mt. Pinos, the highest peak on the Los Padres National Forest. Temperatures range from below freezing in the winter months to 100 degrees and above during the dry summer months.

Because of its high elevation, the area becomes a snow-bunny haven during the winter months. Thousands of visitors from the Los Angeles basin flock to the snow-covered slopes. Use by 10,000 to 20,000 visitors during a winter weekend has a tremendous impact on existing recreation facilities. For example, garbage-can lids are used regularly to slide on, and garbage cans are stolen or damaged beyond repair. Most important, tons of litter are left on the slopes to be cleaned up by District personnel. In 1975, use attributed to snow-play was 53,100 visitor days, and the cost of litter cleanup was \$30,000. Vandalism costs were \$14,430; the costs of the closely related total law enforcement needs were \$11,382.

Another major dispersed recreation activity is offroad motorcycle use. Last year this activity accounted for 250,000 visitor days. On special occasions, such as permitted "enduro" events, some 2000 to 3000 people are

attracted. Fortunately, the organizers of these events are required to provide necessary sanitation facilities, as well as removal of refuse. The majority of offroad vehicle use, however, is not by organized groups. It is the unaffiliated users who are responsible for the considerable litter and vandalism problems of the District. Between 20 and 30 cubic yards of trash are removed from Ballinger Campground every week.

Considerable damage can be done by two-wheel- and four-wheel-drive vehicles during the wet periods of the year. No determination has been made, at this time, of whether this damage is inadvertent or caused by those enthusiasts who want to pit their driving skills against the elements. The rutted roads and scored hillsides soon become water collection troughs that accelerate soil erosion. The impact of these vehicles can be judged by the fact that their owners accounted for 104,358 visitor days of use in 1975.

Acts of negligence and vandalism are not wholly attributable to offroad vehicle use. Campers also do their share of destruction, such as tipping over toilet buildings, breaking stove tops, building firerings, and destroying campground signs. A total of 250,300 visitor days were attributed to camping in 1975.

In recent years we have noticed a rapid increase in promiscuous shooting. All objects become targets for shooters. Garbage cans, campground entrance signs, visitor registration signs, fireplace chimneys, and toilet doors and vents have to be replaced because of shooting. Some visitors even test their shooting ability by felling a tree by successive

¹ Recreation Technician, Mt. Pinos District, Los Padres National Forest, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Frazier Park, California.

shots at the trunk. These are pure wanton acts of destruction.

As you can see, we have had our undue

share of vandalism. I hope that we can gain some insight on this serious problem so that law-abiding citizens can again enjoy their outdoor recreation experience.

Vandalism in Desert Areas

Mike Wintch¹

The story of vandalism in the California desert is undoubtedly similar to many others that might be told by Federal, State and local agencies charged with managing outdoor recreation lands and facilities.

In the desert, representatives of the American public in search of recreation have left their mark in the form of "graffiti" on rocks, trees, picnic tables, outhouses, signs, and historical structures. They have blown up outhouses at developed but primitive camping areas, removed or mutilated signs and markers, torn down historic structures for use as firewood, and done about everything else in between.

They have also planned and participated in projects to remove "graffiti" from canyon walls, clean up major recreation areas, remove hundreds of tons of trash, restore historical objects, construct fences around abandoned mine shafts, clean up trash around a small historical site, and about everything else in between.

The vandalism story includes the expenditure of public monies: the \$10,000 to replace the blown up outhouse, the \$6,500 to replace picnic tables, repair a large interpretive sign and repair another outhouse--all vandalized in one weekend of use at a popular developed camping area--and the inestimable damage to our heritage when historical objects and buildings are torn down and used for firewood. The story also includes the saving of public expenditures in labor costs for the work done by volunteers.

But this traditional story of vandalism is not the one I would like to tell today. Let me share with you two incidents that I

think relate directly to the attitude developed by each individual member of the American outdoor-recreation-seeking public--"to vandalize or not to vandalize."

The first took place less than 100 miles from downtown San Diego, adjacent to giant Anza-Borrego State Desert Park, where the Bureau of Land Management has developed three lovely little primitive campgrounds. They are available and well used by those who visit the Lark Canyon-McCain Valley area. Although they can be reached only by dirt roads, they are readily accessible, most of the time, to Dad, Mom, and the kids in the family "flivver."

Recently, a BLM maintenance man, making one of his three-times-a-week trips into the area, encountered, from a distance, a group of "ruffians" raising Cain in McCain Valley. Fearing for his own safety and the safety of the other good folk camping in the area, he called on the local deputy to venture up the 10 or so miles of dirt road and restore peace and tranquility. Arriving on the scene in his well-equipped patrol car, the deputy encountered the "ruffians" at close range and suggested they mind their manners and keep their motorcycles on the roads and at a respectable speed. The group agreed to comply so the deputy left. However, on his next trip into the area, the following afternoon, the maintenance man encountered "mayhem" including a heavily damaged outhouse.

The second occurred in the Imperial Sand Dunes, a vast sea of sand some 40 miles long and 3 to 5 miles wide, which has stimulated the development of a unique form of outdoor recreation. Developed in southern California, "dune-ing" with offroad vehicles is now popular in much of the Southwest.

This popular area located about 45 minutes east of El Centro, may be visited by up to 50,000 people on a single weekend. The dune-buggy enthusiast, with his ultralight, offroad vehicle, can penetrate this entire sea of sand,

¹ Chief Ranger, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, Riverside, California.

and for years, the whole dune area was available to him. Then, on November 1, 1973, the BLM implemented a vehicle management plan that set apart a portion of the Dunes as a natural research area and posted it as closed to all offroad vehicle use.

With no authority to enforce this closure, the Bureau elected, or was forced, to take an "ambassador of good will" approach and attempt to inform and educate visitors so as to gain their voluntary compliance. The newly-formed ranger force began the task of meeting and greeting the people, informing them of why the natural research area had been set aside, assisting in search and rescue, providing emergency medical first-aid, and assisting the stuck or stranded.

A dunebuggy was obtained to allow the Ranger access to the vast sea of sand, not the fastest buggy on the slopes, but a unique vehicle designed to carry litters, first-aid equipment, and rangers trained to assist those in need. An access road is being built along the threshold of the Dunes and camping facilities are being developed. Last fall a temporary Ranger Station was erected to provide a focal point for BLM influence in the

Dunes.

Significantly, when the signs were first posted around the closed area, about 95 percent were vandalized the first week. Today, with the same amount of ranger patrol and the same authority, this sign vandalism has been reduced by over 95 percent. When the camping facilities were first developed, a large trash receptacle disappeared. Today it seems unlikely that that will happen again.

The temporary Ranger Station, really a house trailer in disguise, was put in place in early September 1975. This station, located miles from any permanent residence, is not manned at all on weekdays and only part of the time on most weekends. Furthermore, it is not protected by a 10-foot high cyclone fence. Yet today not even a window has been broken.

Could it be that for the individual user's, "to vandalize or not to vandalize" is directly associated with the individual manager's attitude--or more importantly, the management group's attitude--that they are to be thought of first and foremost, as a source of public service and assistance?

Vandalism in the Channel Islands National Monument

Ronald W. Sutton¹

The degree of isolation enjoyed by Channel Islands National Monument would seem to be a natural deterrent to vandalism. The Monument consists of the two smallest of the eight Channel Islands off the southern California coast--Anacapa and Santa Barbara Islands. Anacapa is about 10 miles from the mainland, Santa Barbara about 40 miles. The islands can be reached by private or commercial boat, but there are no aircraft landing facilities for public use. Anacapa Island is manned year-round and a ranger is on Santa Barbara Island during the summer.

There have been reports of vandalism problems from the "old hands" during previous seasons. In particular, on Santa Barbara Island, people were shooting at the island and occasionally at the ranger station. People came ashore and dug up plants for their home gardens. They

investigated the sea lion rookeries, causing stampedes which killed pups too small to get out of the way. There was bad feeling between the commercial fishermen and the Park Service. People created new trails which caused erosion and were unsightly. We felt that we could deal with these problems through law enforcement, if necessary, but we also felt that we could prevent many of them with a strong personal contact program between the rangers and the visiting public--protection via interpretation.

The theory behind this program is simple. The park visitor is in the park because he wants to be there, and he looks forward to an enjoyable experience. However, this same visitor brings with him an urban outlook to a wilderness environment. This outlook is not conducive to an understanding of this new (for him) environment, and what he does not understand he may destroy. (Consider a two-year-old child with an electric train. He loves the new toy, but does not understand it and it is soon broken. He may still think it is a great toy,

¹ Seasonal Park Technician, Channel Islands National Monument, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Ventura, California.

but its original purpose is destroyed and its value for others is gone.) If we can create some understanding by the visitor of his new park environment, he will not be so likely to destroy it.

We attempted this by talking to people, morning, noon, and night. We visited them on their boats and passed out litter bags and information sheets. We invited them ashore. We talked about regulations and the reasons for the regulations--how the regulations were designed to protect them and their park. We talked to commercial fishermen about how this was their park and what the Park Service was doing there. We passed out maps of the island and suggested things to do based on the makeup of individual groups. We held impromptu nature walks, often several a day. We set up displays of things for people to touch and wonder about. We tried to contact every individual who came within the park boundary. We gave campfire programs to campers, not on natural history subjects, but on how to take care of a tiny, fragile, one square-mile island--their island. Above all, we talked, talked, talked--to people.

What were the results of this program? It is difficult to say for sure. Perhaps the problems had been overstated. Perhaps the fact that the island rangers had a small patrol boat for the first time lessened some of the problems that existed in the past, but these facts remain: we only had three firearm violations all summer. Five people out of over five thousand disturbed the sea lion rookeries. Only about 200 yards of new trails appeared. Relations with commercial fishermen were good or excellent. Very few people attempted to remove souvenirs from the island. No plants were taken to home gardens. The most interesting fact, however, is that all the violations that did occur were committed by people we had not had a chance to talk to.

This program was carried out by only two people. Admittedly, we had the ideal condition of controlled access to a use area. (There is only one place to land on the island and only one good anchorage, so we were able to get to the visitors.) I believe this kind of program would be useful in other areas where the access is less controlled. The important things are to give the visitor an understanding of the area and of the new environment in which he finds himself and to provide him with the reasons behind the regulations which are designed to protect him and his outdoor recreation area. I believe this is the most important job the "man on the ground" can do, and it is his job--it can't be left to signs and handouts.

Having been the "man on the ground" for

the past five years, I would like to share some of my observations on the subject of vandalism. Actually, most of what follows are questions more than observations--questions for which I don't pretend to have answers.

Why is it that a well-maintained recreational facility seems to be more or less free of vandalism? I have seen areas that were in good condition stay that way over long periods of time. At the first sign of vandalism, however, almost total destruction followed in a very short period of time. Can a little cleaning compound and elbow grease at the first sign of restroom art prevent a repainting job a few months later? Would a blowtorch, used to produce some artificial exfoliation of the rock under the first "John loves Mary," prevent a scenic area from becoming an outdoor tabloid created in spray paint? I think so. A good maintenance program that takes care of the little things before they become major problems will solve some of our vandalism problems.

How many times has the reader seen posted regulations that were systematically ignored by recreational visitors and enforcement personnel? I have seen it--thank God, not often. Does this situation lead to a lowering of the value of all regulations in the mind of the visitor? Does this obvious contempt for the posted regulation lead to vandalism? I believe that if we post a regulation we should enforce it, or interpret it to gain compliance, or take it down--we should never ignore it.

I recall a situation in which we were just asking for vandalism. We had a pump house, somewhat removed from the campground, that had frosted reinforced glass windows. The windows were constantly being broken. This vandalism had a pattern; one that I didn't see. First a small hole would be broken in one of the windows, presumably so someone could see what was inside. (There was nothing inside except an electric pump.) Then, in a few days all of the windows would be broken and we would have to replace them, always with frosted, reinforced glass. Couldn't we have put in one pane of clear glass and avoided the whole problem by affording the original curious visitor his look inside? Are there other situations that would lend themselves to this kind of solution? If indeed this would have been a solution, why wasn't it tried?

Perhaps the National Park Service has found the unique solution to the problem of vandalism. We have at El Morro National Monument an entire area set aside to preserve vandalism. We call this particular vandalism "history," however. Incised upon a rocky bluff at El Morro are the names and

sentiments of many of the early explorers of the Southwest, dating back to Don Onates in 1605. Additional "vandalism" is not wanted at El Morro or as Freeman Tilden² in his book The National Parks puts it:

No further names, addresses, or telephone numbers, either on El Morro or on any other natural or manmade feature in the National Park System, are desired. This may seem odd to

² Tilden, Freeman. 1951. *The national parks: What they mean to you and me.* 417 p. Alfred Knopf, New York.

today's aspirants for immortality. They must remember that they are not Don Onates, and the year is not 1605. Requirements and values shift with the years.

The values of some people have not changed, however, and therein may be the solution of the problem of vandalism. We need to find a way to bring the values of some of our visitors up to date. Maybe we can do it by talking to them, or by strict enforcement or by...what?

I don't know the answer, but I do know we can't afford to wait 200 years so we can call vandalism history.

Vandalism in California State Parks

Thomas Miller¹

The dictionary defines vandalism as "the willful destruction or defacement of artistic works, or property in general." A few examples of vandalism are defaced signs, broken windows, wall panels kicked out of restrooms, graffiti painted on walls, wooden structures destroyed or used for firewood, historic artifacts painted or mutilated, and vehicles damaged. The list can go on and on. The purpose behind the act of vandalism is often difficult to recognize. I will explore some motives later on in this paper.

To get to the whys of vandalism, let's look at who the vandals are. "Kids--you better believe it! The kids are knocking us apart." True? Not necessarily. "It's the ethnic groups from downtown, that bunch of people that can't even speak English, they are the ones that do the damage." That statement isn't any more true than the one about the kids. The fact is we can't pin the tag of vandals on any particular segment of the population. As an example, I have witnessed people from the "establishment" (you remember that term--over 30, live in a house they are buying, etc.) doing things that resulted in the defacement or destruction of property--property that was not their own--public property. That meets the definition of VANDALISM.

I specifically recall a man of about 30,

cutting his initials into a tree. The tree, by the way, was so scribed with initials that it was dying from the cuts, just as though someone had girdled the trunk. The man was willfully destroying the tree, an act of vandalism. Upon my questioning, he told me in no uncertain terms that he was not doing anything wrong! This is an illustration of part of our problem. Many vandals may not even recognize that they are vandals.

Who then are the vandals? We may all be vandals at one time or another, depending on our impact upon the property around us as we go through our daily routine. If what we do results in damage or destruction of property, we have vandalized. What about the willful part? Vandalism is work: some acts take more energy than most people are willing to expend while earning wages on their jobs. They aren't being paid to vandalize--what they do is voluntary and willful.

Who are the vandals? Anyone who is strong enough and old enough to do something that defaces or destroys the property of others. That's most of us. When many people are capable of being vandals, it's no wonder that vandalism is a big problem. Because vandalism is an act that results in the destruction of property, and almost everyone is capable of committing an act of vandalism, the big question is why?

Some experts have demonstrated that vandalism results from the need for recognition. Good results in reducing vandalism have been

¹ Area Manager, State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Huntington Beach, California.

achieved at Grape Elementary School in Watts through a program designed to provide positive recognition for all of the students. This is an approach beyond my ability to explore and develop. I am hopeful the psychologists will continue working along these lines and eventually suggest ways to provide for the individual's need for recognition.

Some causes of vandalism are less clearly connected with the need for recognition. Selfishness is high on the list. Selfish acts often occur in the quest for firewood. The act of vandalism includes reducing items to a size that will fit in the fire. Anything made of wood is the target, and signs, posts, doors, food locker shelves, and wall panels are examples. The trees and undergrowth in the camping areas are also sacrificed in the quest for fuel.

Another example of the selfish motive for vandalism can be observed in areas of historic interest. Photographers have been known to paint over pictographs so they will provide enough contrast to show against rock backgrounds. Historic pictographs have been destroyed through such acts of vandalism. Unauthorized digging in archeological sites destroys the story of events. Artifacts, once removed, become only conversation pieces in the hands of untrained people who have selfishly deprived others of enjoyment.

Retaliation is another reason behind vandalism. Acts of retaliation are typically those that happen in the dark of night. The lifeguard tower that was chopped down and the building with all of the windows knocked out are examples. It is the vandalism of retaliation that we in the field can do the most about. It represents our public image barometer. If we have a significant amount

of retaliatory vandalism we have a significant public image problem. How can you tell if the vandalism was retaliatory? It is not difficult; take a look at what your organization did yesterday. It is amazing how the vandalism correlates with arrests or other enforcement acts. For example, in one area we know that all of the windows would be broken out of our entrance stations whenever enforcement action was taken against a local group. I'm not proposing that we turn away from controlling the negative actions of visitors with the result that one group infringes on the rights of others. I am saying that if vandalism is the result of a lack of respect, then to lose the respect of visitors will increase the vandalism rate; the opposite is of course true--gain the respect of visitors and reduce vandalism problems. To focus on vandalism is to focus on the relationship between the users and the agency that manages the land.

What does vandalism cost? It is not easy to put a dollar value on it. We know that in one area the cost to repair damage caused by vandals was \$2,330 during the summer of 1975. That figure does not truly represent the costs of vandalism because the loss of availability of the facilities to other people cannot be calculated. Neither can the permanent loss of resources such as trees, understory brush, soil, or historic artifacts be represented by a dollar amount.

The costs of vandalism are going up every day, along with the increased desire of the public to utilize public property. The costs are too high for us to chalk up as the expected cost of providing for public need. We have a responsibility to attempt to reduce the cost by attempting to reduce the rate of vandalism.

Vandalism in a City Park

Richard Samp¹

A great deal of so-called vandalism is caused by accident and is not really vandalism at all. The term "vandalism" is a marvelous catchall for public apathy, ignorance, lack of concern and/or intellectual laziness.

In Placentia, the only vandals are the designers, specifiers, and installers who provide the opportunity for the so-called vandalism to occur, and over the years I must include myself as one of these. Seventy-five percent of what is labeled "vandalism" in the city of Placentia could be prevented through design. The remaining 25 percent is malicious and unaccountable.

¹ Director of Recreation and Maintenance, City of Placentia, California.

We feel that vandalism is an attitude and is controllable for the most part. Our records show that the wanton and malicious destruction is often done by groups, usually young males in the 14 to 16 age group. We have also noted that this age group holds the largest number of school dropouts and others who enter the mainstream of adult life unprepared to act according to adult rules, and too young to be given the status that would go with compliance.

Destruction in the expression of a need, and an interpretive look at the motivations behind these kinds of vandalism may open the door to innovative solutions. I have taken the liberty of classifying vandalism in the city of Placentia in six categories². I would like to share these with you:

1. Vandalism of overuse--This type of vandalism can take many forms. You can swing only so many times until the chain wears out. How many kids can sit on a bench? How many balls can go through a hoop? And the merry-go-round has only so many turns.

2. Conflict vandalism--This is the reaction to a tot lot built in the middle of a baseball field, a concrete climber built on the basketball court, a fence where a gate should be, and grass where kids want to walk. It is the expression of kids doing what is logical and most natural and/or most appropriate to them regardless of the designer's intent. It may be a tree planted where kids want to play ball or it may be the perfect place to use for second base or to swing on the way to third--a tree breaks and "vandals" are blamed. Vandalism may be the tree branch too low to walk under, too long to walk around, or just the right height to swing on.

3. Leverage vandalism--This usually prevails during baseball season. It's finding a hole or a slot just the right size to pry with a baseball bat. The bat is stuck in a hole, the board is pried loose from the bench, the loose board is then carried to the jungle gym, where it is propped on the bars to form a cantilever. It is the concrete trash can which couldn't possibly be stolen, but of course, it also can't be emptied because it weighs too much, especially after the removable steel liner has been carried away. If it doesn't work as a trash can, maybe it can be used as a battering ram.

4. Curiosity vandalism--This is the answer to what is behind the locked door or behind the sprinkler controller or under the manhole

cover. It is the act of jamming a stick in the drinking fountain to see how high the water will squirt, plugging a drain to see how high the water will rise, pulling up a tree to see what the roots look like, and taking apart the playground climber to check the construction.

5. Irresistible temptation vandalism--This is writing on a shiny painted surface with a magic marker or riding a bicycle through the big mud puddle in the new lawn where the drainage is improper. It is climbing out on a tree branch to see how far it will bend or throwing a bottle against a concrete wall. It is picking flowers or unscrewing the beautiful brass thing on top of the fountain because it fits so nicely in the palm of one's hand.

6. The no-other-way-to-do-it vandalism--This is why the bicycle is leaned up against the tree when there is no bicycle rack. It is throwing papers and bottles on the ground when there is no trash can and using the sand box when there is no restroom or when, worse yet, the restroom is locked. It is sitting on the fence and hanging your jacket on a tree.

During the years, we have found that many administrators, faced with finding solutions to vandalism, expressed their reaction in two classic attitudes. The "bastille" approach is building something so strong, so massive, and so simple that kids couldn't possibly tear it down. It's just to make sure, erecting a high fence so the kids can play only when administrators let them, and if the equipment still gets broken, locking the gates.

The "zero" approach provides nothing, therefore there is nothing to break. Put up a fence with no gates, pave the area but don't plant trees or grass.

We in Placentia feel the only solution is a creative approach. It is to try to understand a child in search of diversion after school, to anticipate the alternatives and opportunities open for overuse, conflicting uses, or misuse of playground environments.

Possible solutions for some of the varieties of vandalism which I have spoken about include:

1. Provide sufficient equipment to discourage overuse
2. Build a path where the kids walk, provide a gate next to the hole in the fence. Plant more trees and provide a way to run through the flower beds so kids and plants can grow together
3. Unlock the gates or remove them so they won't be torn down, prevent the gate from becoming a swing

² V. Michael Weinmayer. 1973. Vandalism by Design, A Critique. In Reflections in the recreation and park movement. David Gray, ed. Wm. C. Brown Company.

4. Check and remove loose boards and stray items used as levers and hammers

5. Mount trash cans on poles, replace when damaged and empty when full

6. Use timbers, difficult to write on, but can accommodate graffiti, and they mellow with age

7. Bicycles should have racks and people should have benches

8. Install wrought iron fences to control cross circulation. This use will help stop kids from running into the street but will

not cause problems by catching windblown debris

Vandalism in Placentia has been a problem. We do not have the answers. The thing that we have learned the hard way is that there is no such thing as a maintenance-free park--maintainable, yes, but not maintenance-free. We have environmental impact reports. Every development contemplated should also have a maintenance impact report that identifies areas and items which require maintenance and will cost money over the years. Parks need care every day, improvements every year, and major rehabilitation about every 5 years. Kids in Placentia do not destroy what they want, like, and use.

Vandalism in Organized Camps in California

Patrick C. Dickson¹

The American Camping Association in California represents approximately 500 member agency camps, private independent camps, and church-affiliated camps. Annually the Association provides organized camping opportunities for approximately 1.2 million young Californians and an additional 500,000 adults use member facilities during the off season.

During the past three years, according to insurance carriers, dollar losses due to vandalism have been minimal, with less than 1 percent of the total membership reporting substantial dollar losses. This trend appears to be consistent even with increasing exposure due to increasing enrollments and programs utilizing facilities on a year-round basis. The major problem facing camp operators is coping with

vandalism appearing in two forms: (1) External Forces: vandalism done during nonscheduled times by "outsiders" and (2) Internal Forces: abuse of facilities during organized programs.

The member camps of the American Camping Association have minimized dollar losses due to vandalism by subscribing to rigid accreditation standards which require sound site planning and sound administrative procedures in the organized camp and camping program. Furthermore, a high percentage of member camps have engaged fulltime onsite caretakers to patrol and act as a deterrent to possible threat from external vandals. Internally, member camps have instituted ongoing educational programs for the participants, emphasizing and providing opportunities and experiences for developing awareness and appreciation of the interdependence of all living and nonliving resources and a sense of responsibility for them.

¹ Vice-President, Southern California Camping Association, North Ridge, California.

LAW ENFORCEMENT



Photo: East Bay Regional Park District



Vandalism and Law Enforcement on National Forest Lands

Thomas A. Hoots¹

Vandalism on National Forest lands, as well as on other land in both public and private ownership, is relatively new. The campgrounds and facilities on Forest land have been open to the public on a self-service basis as long as the Forests have been in existence. Up until the mid-1960's, a camper could leave equipment and food readily visible to any passersby without fear of loss. Signs could be erected in campgrounds with full knowledge that those signs would remain in good condition until such time as the weather might fade the colors. The worst vandalism that occurred in the National Forests was caused by bears. I can recall sitting in meetings similar to this one, trying to figure out what we could do to minimize bear damage. Bears are still around, but we certainly don't spend much time talking about the vandalism or difficulties they create.

The current problems are people, not all people, but just a very small minority of people who have created a condition among the National Forests that is causing great concern.

Who are these people? What has changed that makes it all right to destroy \$336,000 worth of improvements in the four southern California Forests? What right have these people to deprive the general public of 26,000 visits to a National forest to enjoy a camping experience? Yes--facilities for 26,000 visits could have been built and maintained with the dollars spent in replacing damaged and destroyed improvements. What cost can be placed on painted rocks and carved or chopped trees?

A change has occurred since the 1950's. During the 1960's, a new generation discovered the great out-of-doors and with it the National Forests. Their culture developed in the cities and was foreign to the parks and forest. It was marked by laziness, softness, and disrespect. President Kennedy identified the problem to some extent and encouraged physical

fitness programs. There is much discussion now about the apparent destruction caused by the timber industry. I often wonder how it compares with that in recreation areas caused by the tremendous increase in use we have recently experienced.

We know some things about these new user groups. We know that they are young and city oriented. We know many lack the know-how or awareness of how to treat nature. We see an increase of users from cultures other than Anglos and from low-income groups. We see people who have been sold on an outdoor experience by salesmanship for new products for use in the open.

From 1968 to 1973, I was a District Ranger at Pinecrest on the Stanislaus National Forest. It is about 50 miles north of Yosemite National Park, and is part of one of the most heavily used of the National Forests. During this time, the changes in user groups became clear. Probably the most spectacular evidence came in Yosemite Park where Park Rangers on horseback confronted hundreds of "hippies" in a meadow. The results, besides many arrests, were injuries, a dead horse, and a destroyed meadow. What caused the confrontation with baton-swinging Rangers? The unlawful use of the meadow for a camping spot. Sounds silly? To the hippies, the right to camp there was worth fighting for, and to the Rangers, keeping the campers out of there was necessary to support the principle the parks were established for--the protection and preservation of a unique national heritage.

At Pinecrest, we were faced with similar problems, but were fortunate in being able to see and learn from the Park's problems. We saw riots, numerous arrests, and destruction of property. We made some studies of these problems, which include 109 incidents of vandalism in 1970 alone. We found that 62 percent of the incidents were caused by people under 21 years old. Also, we found that vandalism and thefts occurred between the hours of 10 and 11 A.M., 2 to 4 P.M., and 8 to 11 P.M. These included only the incidents for which we had enough information to make a record. Conditions have changed, but vandalism is still here and even increasing. The new user groups are also still

¹ Forest Recreation Officer, San Bernardino National Forest, Forest Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, San Bernardino, California.

here, though not as easy to identify.

On the San Bernardino National Forest, we are finding that vandalism problems are occurring more frequently during periods of low use, on weekends, and during the off-season, when the facilities are untended. We also see higher vandalism occurring in areas more heavily used by low-income groups, and in areas within 30 minutes of valley communities.

A prime example of this type of vandalism occurred last month in a campground about an hour from the San Bernardino Valley. The campground was completely rebuilt last fall in a cooperative venture of the Southern California Association of Four-Wheel-Drive Clubs. The campground is along a dirt road and was then covered with about 6 inches of snow. About three groups of young people were camped there, most of them teenagers with no adult supervision. Someone had sawn the wooden barrier rails into firewood sizes and had also taken a table top apart and sawn it up. There was fresh evidence of sawdust in the snow. At all three campsites, burnt or burning parts of the barriers and tables were in the fireplaces. When we questioned members of the groups, naturally all of them denied any knowledge of how the wood was cut. They said they found it lying there, cut up. From a law enforcement standpoint, even though circumstantial evidence strongly indicated that someone in those camps was responsible for the destruction of the rails, barriers, and table tops, we could do nothing.

To keep campgrounds open, in such a situation, means having caretakers present to assure the protection of the facilities. Unfortunately, it is costly to put caretakers in campgrounds with minimum use. It is almost impossible to effectively close off the campgrounds, because this would require closing many of the main roads and highways within the Forest.

A strong, tough law enforcement program is needed to minimize the vandalism problem as well as to provide some feeling of security for the recreationist. We need to be cautious, however, that we do not penalize the honest user by presenting him with complicated or restrictive requirements that destroy his experience. The average person won't mind some inconvenience if he knows it will provide him with security for his family and protection against theft.

One trap which recreation managers must avoid is becoming "cops" and forgetting the prime purpose of their jobs. In other words, "When you are up to your waist in alligators it is easy to forget your objective was to drain the swamp." Speaking from experience, I found

myself in 1969 and 1970 chasing pot users and minors with alcoholic beverages, and dealing with nudity problems and even grand theft, rape, suicide, and murder. There was a fine line between problems associated with the recreation users and their experience and just plain law enforcement problems. I had to cross that line before I recognized where it was.

As we examine vandalism on National Forest lands, we tend to concentrate on the large developed facilities. An area of increasing importance and increasing use which is often overlooked is backcountry. When speaking of backcountry, we frequently think of wilderness, but I am referring to any minimum-development area. This means road- or trail-access areas primarily but could be any area. Here vandalism is really a serious problem. There is virtually no way to stop the destructive force. Fortunately, those who are bent on destruction do not visit these areas frequently unless there are roads. The signs certainly reflect this.

Some of the improvements vandalized are pit-type toilets, signs (great targets for the marksman), nature trails and water developments. The beauty of the forest itself is also destroyed. How can these areas be protected? Now, when they are destroyed, we frequently remove the improvements. In one campground where a replacement toilet was shot up within 6 months, and the tables were stolen, cut up, or burned, we just closed the area. Hundreds of visitor days of public use were lost. The public is paying for the vandalism in more than dollars. How can we measure the loss in vegetation caused by cutting down, carving or chopping trees, or by the worst of enemies--fire? The \$336,000, previously mentioned, does not begin to measure the various types of monetary, esthetic, and emotional losses.

IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM

We have discussed the evidence. Now what has been or can be done? Many methods have proven successful for individual problems and many more have proven unsuccessful. Before looking at some individual solutions, we should first learn the components of the problem. All instances of vandalism are not the same. We should start asking questions:

1. What was the result of the action--what was damaged or destroyed?
2. Who is causing the problem--what is the age group of users, where do they come from?
3. When does the problem occur--night time, weekdays, off season? Can a time of day

be identified?

4. Why does it occur? Disrespect, anger, frustration, boredom?

5. Are the facilities designed to minimize vandalism?

Some of these questions may be easily answered, but what about the more difficult ones? I am a believer in public involvement. Public involvement may be time consuming and may not answer all of our questions, but I feel it is our most promising opportunity to find answers. Go to the user groups and rap with them about what's going on. Spend some time with the groups who are suspected of creating most of the difficulties. Listen to their suggestions. Understand what is important to them. Learn their values. Seek the cooperation of the users not only in studying the problems but in repairing some of the damage or in designing new protective devices.

Consider the cultural differences between user groups and their relation to facility design. The most outstanding difference I am aware of is in the typical family unit design. Almost 100 percent of the San Bernardino Forest campgrounds are designed as single family units, capable of serving 5 to 8 persons at one time. The Mexican-American family typically consists of the immediate family, the relatives, and a few friends, and can include 3 to 5 vehicles and 10 to 20 people. What happens when they arrive? They all must crowd into the family unit, which means removing the barrier or driving over it. The large numbers of people can't help but trample the vegetation. The campground becomes crowded, ruining the experiences of others, and the facilities are overused for their design. When the Ranger arrives, he hassles the group for having too many people and for the mis-parked vehicles; he either asks them to move or writes them a citation. The group gets mad and stops caring for the facility. They may leave, but they leave behind litter and broken facilities, and everyone has had an unhappy experience.

Is this sequence of events necessary? It occurs because we are not providing a design to meet the needs of all the using public, with a result frequently classified as vandalism.

Clear, concise signing is part of the same problem. Where are the bilingual signs? In southern California, recognizing the different needs of different cultures, especially the needs of the Spanish-speaking peoples, is a must.

FINDING SOLUTIONS

The various techniques for reducing vandalism can be classified in three basic categories: public assistance, direct control, and engineering.

Public Assistance

A public assistance program tends to increase the user's enjoyment of the area by providing a feeling of security and increasing user understanding of facilities, activities, and the environment.

Providing maps and brochures is probably the first step in this process and has been used at many areas for a long time. These should be printed bilingually where non-English speaking cultures compose a significant part of the user group. People inexperienced in the use of English misinterpret statements even though they can read the words.

Signs, preferably symbol signs, certainly aid in minimizing confusion and lowering frustration levels. Where signing may be difficult or expensive, the use of radios with limited range transmission which can be received on automobile radios can help. Again, use bilingual messages.

Information specialists, who are bilingual where appropriate, can provide some personal touch and promote facility security by their presence. In lieu of manned stations, well-designed and displayed bulletin boards and kiosks provide opportunities for expanding the user's knowledge.

At Pinecrest, we developed positions called Public Assistance Officers. These recreation aids were given public contact training, information on questions commonly asked, first aid training, and law enforcement training. Their job was to work with the public and to take a firm hand when and where necessary. They had direct contact with the resident deputy sheriff through special radios. These persons enabled us to achieve successful control of a difficult situation principally because they took the time to talk to the users.

Another program which helped was "Pack-in, Pack-out" which was used in the backcountry. Personal plastic garbage bags were provided, with the rules imprinted in a colorful and artistic manner. These bags eliminated a large amount of litter and allowed 15 to 20 garbage cans to be removed. Previously, many of the cans had to be replaced annually because they

were shot, stolen, or otherwise destroyed. Contests proved successful among the younger people. One which has been going on for 3 years is the pop-top chain. The person with the longest chain gets a Smokey Bear patch.

Direct Controls

Direct controls are those which impose some form of control over the user. These are frequently effective but they also tend to destroy the designed recreation experience if not done cautiously and with some thought.

Perhaps the most popular control is the entrance station. The National Park Service has been using this form of control for many years. Entrance stations do not have to be elaborate. I once used an old out-house, repainted and slightly redesigned. In some areas, gates which are closed at 10 P.M. have been used; these prohibit the entrance of people who are not actually camping on the site.

The San Bernardino, as well as other National Forests, is using permanent caretakers in the campground. These caretakers usually occupy the first camp unit, and live in a trailer which remains for the season. They collect fees, process reservations, do some facility cleanup, and provide security. The Inyo Forest is presently seeking volunteers, from among the retired senior citizens, to fill these positions. As volunteers, the caretakers receive a uniform, some training, and expense money but no wages. They sometimes work in sites also controlled by entrance stations.

User permits, such as those issued for wilderness areas, provide a certain psychological control because the agency has the user's name and address and the user is given a speci-

fied time to use the area. He is even directed to the exact spot he is permitted to use.

Engineering

Engineering includes the design and construction of facilities. Design plays a major role. It includes the basic campground layout (camp loops, size of units, location of signs, garbage cans, restrooms, and entrance stations) as well as the actual design of a given facility. For example, in isolated locations, rocks or cement barriers may be used in lieu of easily destroyed wooden barriers and rails. In one camp, we have resorted to concrete bunkers for restrooms because the standard ones were repeatedly destroyed. These are certainly not meeting our visual quality objectives, but the toilets are available and are only being painted with names and some choice phrases, rather than being destroyed. Our engineers and landscape architects play a valuable role in design, but they must also understand the objectives of a recreation experience.

SUMMARY

The vandalism problem is definitely a difficult one to solve. I think each Unit Manager has to examine his own problems and his own users, seek public involvement, and develop solutions that are adapted to the particular area. Through this symposium, each of us will acquire a so-called "bag of tricks," from which we can select the one that applies to our particular area. Through concerted effort and working with the user, I think that we can reduce the vandalism incidents. For me, however, law enforcement, the "cop" approach, is our least desirable alternative. Prevention, through user involvement, should be our first aim.

Vandalism: The California State Park Approach

Jerry Morrison¹

The California Department of Parks and Recreation has a history of setting an example of how to approach criminal incidents, including vandalism. In 1968, the Legislature, through the California Peace Officers Standards and Training Commission, requested a study of

crime in State parks. On the study group's recommendation, six people were hired for the six districts of our Department. These people were chosen for their expertise in police service, and their anticipated approach to the incidence of offenses within the parks. I'm one of the six; my area is District 5, which extends from Santa Barbara County to Orange County and from the ocean east to the Arizona-California line. I deal with two dozen law enforcement agencies within those boundaries.

¹ Law Enforcement and Safety Officer, State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Goleta, California.

The six people chosen for this special duty began almost immediately to improve the training of the Rangers in approaching law enforcement situations. This training has been continued and enhanced; the Rangers now receive the full amount recommended for policemen at our academy in Monterey. Many carry weapons in their daily routine, not by choice, but because it has been found necessary. We recommend a soft approach to law enforcement; however, a firm one. We recommend high visibility. We want the Rangers to be seen, but we do not want them to be oppressive. We want them to approach problems before they develop, if possible, and to talk with the people to try to establish a relationship with them, try to establish some understanding by them of why we have our rules, and try to educate them about what these rules are.

We are here concerned with the explicit act of vandalism. Vandalism is defined as wanton destruction; it is a criminal offense. Again, it is an offense of negligence as often as not--like not stopping at a stop sign in a traffic situation. It can be an offense of ignorance, like not stopping for a red light because one is color blind. It can be vindictiveness towards what has occurred in that place or maybe a reaction against a symbol of authority or the system. It can be a social thing, a need for recognition for a culture or an individual personality, such as drawing a symbol on the restroom--a symbol that identifies the individual and his personality. This is not really an endeavor to damage, not an intention to hurt, but an act of seeking identification. Therefore, we find that vandalism can be negligence, ignorance, vindictiveness, or self-expression or all of these.

We are also concerned with the dimensions of the problem and how to measure it. We have to guess. We can guess on the basis of data, but this is faulty, and I can explain why. The most recent FBI Uniform Crime Report was for the year 1974. It stated that 7000 arrests for vandalism in rural areas in this country were reported during that year. However, vandalism arrests are not easy to make. For each arrest there are many, many offenses that are committed by persons unknown. Data provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation shows that the age of persons arrested for vandalism ranges from very young to quite old, and there is a significantly large group between the ages of 13 and 14 years. Attempts are made to measure vandalism by the amount of money we spend for repair. My department budgets \$50,000 per year; however, we had \$87,000 damage reported in 1975. I would say that a minimum of double that amount is the true figure: we probably suffer over \$180,000 vandalism damage per year in our department. I base this on the fact that no one likes to make reports. In our system, there is one crime report to be made on the vandalism

itself and another to recover the money for the damage. Many of our people say, "Oh, fix it and forget it," rather than take the time to make the reports. In other places, some may say in effect, "As long as we don't report problems, people will think we have it under control and we'll build a great reputation." A great reputation--yes--but things are getting ripped off; it's like the sea eating away at a cliff until a shoreline house falls in the drink, and then it's too late.

What do we do about vandalism? What action do we take? I must admit that I have committed an act in a Federal forest that could be construed as vandalism. I moved a rock so that I could park my camper in a location that I deemed better. The regular parking place was in bright, hot sun. The rock was preventing me from moving to where it was shady, so I moved the rock and parked in the shade. My point is that the campsite should have been designed to take the campers needs into account. It is not enough to simply set rocks around and say to the camper, "Park there." Good design would see to it, for example, that people going to a day use area don't go through a campground to get there. Why not? Because after they have been there, enjoyed their picnic, and drunk a few beers, if they must leave through the campground, and if there is something there that is not being guarded, they can just pick it up. Furthermore, they find a handy place to throw away their beer cans as they pass through.

We should have our people in the use area where they can be seen and can be talked to when visitors are there. Make guards or caretakers visible. Have them talk to the people before trouble begins. Help them to understand what the rules are, and why they are needed.

In summing up, I believe a wide selection of disciplines are needed to uncover solutions to the vandalism problem. Hopefully, we can identify some new approaches, some actions that will help us in this exercise in waste.

Vandalism at Red Rock

John C. Einolander¹

Vandalism calls are an everyday experience for a law enforcement officer. Usually acts of vandalism are perpetrated by juveniles. Vandalism, along with all other crimes, is on the increase. Last year, the largest rise in crime was in the rural areas, where we saw an increase of 21 percent. Vandalism is not new to our modern society. It has been a problem in our cities and towns for centuries. The term vandalism is derived from Vandals, a Germanic people who sacked Rome in 455 A.D. The legal definition of vandalism is "willful or malicious destruction, injury, disfigurement, or defacement of property without consent of the owner or person having custody or control." This crime is classified as a misdemeanor, and is punishable by a fine, a short term in jail, or both.

Vandals can strike at any location. However, their favorite targets have been city schools and parks. In the past 10 years, the monetary loss from acts of vandalism has risen to 3 to 4 billion dollars a year. As every victim and every law enforcement officer knows, it is often extremely difficult to apprehend vandals. Many cities have devised innovative methods to prevent and detect vandalism, only to find that methods to circumvent detection are quickly devised in turn. Expensive electronic sensors and closed-circuit television systems have been installed, but with only marginal success in many areas. As an experiment, Washington, D.C. installed \$365,000 worth of sodium vapor lighting equipment in certain areas. They were rewarded with a 22 percent reduction in vandalism. Washington has greatly increased the area covered by their sodium vapor lighting program. This is apparently one method that has met with success.

Although vandalism is not at all new to the cities of our United States, it has become a new and ever-increasing

problem in the National Forests and Parks. In the Santa Barbara District of the Los Padres National Forest, there is an area known nationally among young people as "Red Rock." This canyon area has a 10-mile winding stretch of two lane rough road along the Santa Ynez River. The river is surrounded by rugged mountains, and entry to much of the area is restricted during the summer months because of the extreme fire danger. The official name of the area is "The Lower Santa Ynez Recreational District." There are ten campgrounds, of which three are for daytime use only, and seven are for overnight use. The area is designed to accommodate approximately 4000 persons for recreational day use, and a maximum of only 1500 for overnight camping. Over the last 6 years, in this small area, both day and overnight use has increased phenomenally. On heavy-use weekends during the summer months over the past few years, as many as 15,000 people entered the canyon on a single day. The crowds heavily overloaded the facilities and the reasonable capability of the terrain to support use. Along with the increased use came a large rise in city-type problems, and city-type crime--traffic congestion, family fights, drunkenness, narcotics use, shootings, thefts, robbery, and assault, along with litter pollution, and a tragic upsurge in vandalism.

Here are only a few examples of what has occurred in the small recreation area of "Red Rock":

Spray painting of cliffs, rocks, toilets, signs, trees, and tables with obscene words or person's names

Chopping down of trees, shrubbery, and signs

Mutilation of buildings, toilet facilities, water pipes and water systems, camp tables, stoves, and anything else that can be destroyed

Destruction of vegetation by driving motorcycles and other vehicles through the campsites and across the natural countryside and spinning the wheels or sliding sidewise (commonly known in city lingo as "yard farming")

¹ Sergeant, County of Santa Barbara, Sheriff's Department, Santa Barbara, California

Shooting of holes in buildings, toilets, tables, trash bins, and trees

Burning of anything in sight that can be chopped down and burned, including camp tables and other facilities

In those we have apprehended for acts of vandalism, we have seen a strange, don't-give-a-damn attitude. One group was caught in the act of burning their camp table in the camp stove, piece by piece. Their comment was "It wasn't worth much anyway." One man, chopping down a live tree, states, "Well, how else can I get my camper backed next to the camp table?" A 28-year-old, who had blocked the road by rolling large rocks across it, said, "It's too damned crowded, and I wanted to keep some of those nuts out of here." Two men who were arrested for shooting into an occupied toilet facility stated, "Aw! We were just having a little fun. He didn't get hurt." On a dark, moonless night, in a crowded campground, one fellow fired 40 rounds from his 30.06 rifle in random directions. He claimed that he had heard ominous rustling in the surrounding bushes, and he thought somebody was going to get him.

In order to help maintain the peace, and to preserve the facilities in the Lower Santa Ynez Recreational District, the Forest Service contracted with the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department to assist them. Sheriff's Deputies began working weekends during the summer months of 1970. This first summer, one full-time Deputy and several reserve officers patrolled throughout the area. The recreational population increased, and the crime increased to a point that in 1975 it was necessary to have as many as twelve Deputies patrolling on the weekends just to maintain an acceptable level of order. It also became necessary to maintain two to four full-time patrolmen throughout the winter months because of the increase in mountain area use.

I said that as many as twelve Deputies were required to maintain an acceptable level of order. We were unable to stem the acts of vandalism. In the summer of 1974, the Santa Ynez Campground, which provides nice, wide-open tree-covered campsites with toilet facilities, camp tables, stoves, and running water, was damaged to the point that it had to be closed.

In 1975, summer campers destroyed the Red Rock Campground, and it was closed. In both these camps, toilets were smashed, tables were burned for firewood, and steel stoves were cut from their 2 1/2-inch pipe mounts and stolen. Trash cans were run over or shot up, and some were also stolen. Trees were chopped down, and rock and wood camp barriers were

driven over, moved, and mutilated. Grim? You bet it's grim! The Forest Service estimated that during the year, in this small area alone, there was \$25,000 damage to the recreational facilities.

Campsites are expensive, material and man-hours for repair or rebuilding are expensive, and patrol time for law enforcement is expensive. Is there an answer on how to solve this wanton destruction of property? I don't know the answer. We seem to be losing the battle.

Of the methods used in the Red Rock area to try to stem this type of vandalism, some have proved to be fairly successful:

Sheriff's Deputies and Forest patrolmen, in uniform, driving marked vehicles, patrol the campsites at random times throughout the day and night hours

Sheriff's Deputies on foot, in uniform, walk through the camps during the day and night hours at unscheduled times

Deputies on horseback and on foot patrol the river banks and out-of-the-way spots where campers congregate (horseback patrol appeared to be a good psychological deterrent to acts of vandalism)

Problem areas were staked out with camera equipment, to take photos of vandals in action so as to apprehend them

The Forest established a temporary check station at the entrance to the canyon. Each car was stopped, its license number recorded, and the driver provided with a copy of the Federal camp regulations

The Forest tried camp sitters who lived, rent-free, in trailers, and reported any suspicious activity

Enforcement of the rules and regulations, both State and Federal, was used as a method of prevention. Sheriff's Deputies issued approximately 1200 citations, arrested 350 people, wrote 800 crime reports, and issued thousands of verbal warnings

It is very clear that vandalism is a big problem in the National Forest. I see no end in sight. The projections state that an approximate 15 percent increase in use of the National Forest lands will occur each year. This means more vandalism. At the rate we are seeing the camp areas destroyed, we may face limiting camp use to a select few, or closing campgrounds during certain periods.

A solution to the vandalism epidemic must be found. Otherwise, it will soon mushroom to such outrageous proportions that outdoor activities and camping in our National Forests will be only a memory.

Law Enforcement and Vandalism in Our National Parks

Nicholas Whelan¹

National Parks were established in the United States in 1872, with Yellowstone our country's first public pleasuring ground. From that time on, areas of the National Park System have been bothered to a greater or lesser degree by problems of vandalism. Our first visitors shot Yellowstone's wildlife, cut trees, marked up or tore down geyser formations, and in general acted in an irresponsible and short-sighted manner.

Initially we were absolutely powerless to stop any of these actions because we had no people in charge and no laws (a common complaint among many agencies even these days). If a Park was lucky, it had a superintendent, assuming someone could be found who would work for nothing, because that was the pay for the job. If a violator was actually caught doing something seriously wrong, the only power the superintendent had was to put the person out of the Park. The problems became so overwhelming that in 1886 the Secretary of the Interior asked the Secretary of War for help; for the next 30 years the army controlled the Parks--not an ideal solution, but at least during that time these areas were protected.

In 1894 Congress passed the first protective law for the Parks, an "Act to Protect the Birds and Animals in Yellowstone National Park," and in 1906 the Antiquities Act was passed to protect archeological sites; both of these gave the Parks laws pertaining to the protection of specific features.

It was not until 1916, however, that the National Park Service was established, and the enabling act also gave us a general idea, finally, about what the Park Service was

supposed to consider important, nicely summed up in these few words, "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for future generations."

Now we have about 300 areas and almost 2000 permanent rangers; we were visited by millions of persons last year, and investigated thousands of cases of vandalism. Our National Park Service rangers are authorized by Title 18 of the U.S. Code to be Federal Law Enforcement Officers, and the laws pertaining specifically to National Park Service areas are contained in Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations (naturally, these are all misdemeanor offenses). Our role, in other words, is much better defined than it was during those first few years at Yellowstone and Sequoia. Nevertheless, National Park Service law enforcement remains a bit enigmatic to many outside of the service because it is not absolutely structured and contains several variables.

For instance, our Park areas may be governed by any one of three different kinds of jurisdiction. Some Parks have "exclusive" jurisdiction, whereby Federal law is the only law and Federal officers the only law officers. Most older Parks have this type of jurisdiction (or a slight variation of it). Most of these Parks were established before the States they are in were admitted, so it's easy to see how this type of jurisdiction developed.

A second and quite common type is "concurrent" jurisdiction, in which the Parks are governed by Federal laws (not just the Code 8 Federal Regulations but also the U.S. Code) and by State laws equally, and both Federal and State officers can enforce them. Parks which have this type of jurisdiction fall under

¹ Park Ranger, Channel Islands National Monument, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Ventura, California

the Assimilative Crimes Act, which means that laws other than Federal laws within that particular political area are automatically assimilated into the laws of that Park.

Channel Islands National Monument has the third type of jurisdiction, "proprietary," which is in many instances the least desirable of the three from the viewpoint of the Federal officer in the field. Under this type of jurisdiction, the Park Service has no more power than the owner or proprietor of any other piece of land. We may, as proprietors, modify State laws to make them more restrictive, but we may not make them less so. The one concession we have to the fact that our role differs slightly from that of other landowners is that we may levy legal punishments when our rules are broken. Within our rules, Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, there are sections which enable the Parks to assimilate State fishing and motor vehicle laws and U.S. Coast Guard boating regulations. This leaves quite a few laws--for instance, any State felony laws--which Park Rangers may not act upon with any more authority than that of a private citizen. To rectify this situation, many rangers in Parks with proprietary jurisdiction arrange to have themselves deputized by the local sheriff.

To return to the problem of vandalism--this is covered under various sections of Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations and is handled by a citation if this appears warranted. The citation, a National Park Service form, can specify that the violator either appear in court or not; if the citation does not specify that the violator appear, he still has the right to do so, or he may simply mail in the bail forfeiture. This bail is sent, in our case at Channel Islands National Monument, to the Central Violations Bureau of the U.S. District Court in Los Angeles. If a violator wishes a hearing, however, he is directed to the nearest U.S. magistrate. In most of our vandalism cases, the magistrate hearing functions as the trial, and the Ranger who issued the citation has the dual role of prosecutor and prosecution witness.

National Park Service areas differ greatly in the amount of vandalism they receive. I have had the privilege and pleasure of working at some of our more remote areas, including Isle Royale National Park, a 210-square-mile island in Lake Superior, and Katmai National Monument, a 4200-square-mile wilderness in Alaska. I have also worked at Joshua Tree National Monument, a beautiful desert area north of Palm Springs. Joshua Tree has a large

number of visitors, especially in the spring and fall, and most of them, it seems, are from the Los Angeles-San Bernardino area, from which it is a 2-hour ride over Interstate 10 to the Monument. When I worked there, we had our fair share of vandalism, primarily such activities as driving motorbikes off the roads and painting the rocks. The problems were not inordinate, but they were always there.

Conditions were different at Isle Royale. A person wanting to visit the island had to make reservations in advance for a 73-mile boat trip from Houghton, Michigan, which cost a minimum of \$20 and took 8 hours, over one of the roughest freshwater lakes in the world. It seemed to follow that only people who really cared about the kind of place that wilderness island was would take the time to make the trip out. We had so few vandalism problems that it was truly idyllic. Oh, occasionally someone might throw down a piece of paper, but the next visitor coming along would pick it up; and every once in a great while some young person (usually a boy in an olive green uniform in the company of several more young men dressed similarly) might carve upon an aspen tree, but woe to be to him if some other visitor saw the act.

There are various reasons why some places are more prone to vandalism than others. Perhaps those which are harder to visit attract mostly those who care; consequently, problems are minimal. Many other factors also appear to have an influence: the design of a facility; the appropriateness of a sign (often a regulatory sign that isn't really necessary seems to attract abuse as the only means the public has of expressing their frustration and indignation); and the degree to which an area is kept up (we all know that one broken window in a building seems to lead to many more or that one set of initials on a rock seems to overnight--literally--propagate several others).

Frustration is probably one important reason for vandalism. Perhaps a desire for immortality accounts for the names and initials on many rocks and trees. And, of course, many acts of vandalism result from simple lack of appreciation or understanding of those features that we who work in a park consider so important.

It is no closely guarded secret that we in the National Park Service are understaffed, and we long ago found out that we don't have enough Rangers to place one behind every tree in the hope of catching some violator. We also long ago discovered that if we could talk to a visitor before he commenced his park experience, the chances were good that he would have a more enjoyable visit, all other

things being equal, if we could gain the visitor's interest and give him some knowledge, chances were good that we would have no problems with either deliberate or inadvertent vandalism (or any other law enforcement problem).

Interpretation has several meanings, but in its purest sense it seems to me a very Socratic principle: to help someone else understand better an idea or an object or a value--not to explain it to the other person, but to be a vehicle by which he may discover the proper answer himself. This is often a lengthy process and one which we engaged in law enforcement may not have time for. But in the National Parks, at least, we simply cannot afford to divorce interpretation from protection. We have found that just any form of positive

communication with a visitor, whether it's talking about the values of an area, or even just reminding him of our more commonly violated rules and regulations, stands a good chance of insuring that your next contact will not be a law enforcement one.

In parks where personnel are spread so thin that law enforcement Rangers must constantly patrol just to cover the assigned "beat", I will admit that their presence alone is a deterrent to a certain extent. But, in the long run (and often even in the short run), it is not enough. Ultimately, those visitors who understand what you are trying to provide in an area, and who are even a bit protective about it, are the ones who will help to lessen the problem of vandalism. To my mind, law enforcement, by itself, will never be enough.

A Magistrate's View of Vandalism

Willard W. McEwen¹

As a comparatively new U.S. Magistrate it has been a real "eye opener" to view my calendar on the third Friday of each month and see from 50 to 150 arraignments set for misdemeanors allegedly committed in the National Forest area behind Santa Barbara. Approximately 40 percent of this number relate to vandalism.

I was raised in Santa Barbara and spent much of my youth in Boy Scout and Explorer activities relating to the "back country." I own a small cabin on Figueroa Mountain and I'm quite familiar with the geographical area within which these offenses are committed. A defense attorney might consider filing an appropriate affidavit of prejudice on that basis, but thus far it has not occurred. I readily admit that I am "prosecution" oriented; that is, I find it difficult to tolerate the treatment which public facilities receive from the majority of the defendants who appear before me, and I continually search for appropriate lectures and dissertations to express my concern when passing sentence. Concurrently, I search for a sentence that will be meaningful to the defendant and perhaps serve as an example to friends and acquaintances, thereby discouraging similar conduct on their part.

We have worked out a sentence system similar to that of the Valyermo Ranger District--pay the fine, serve time in jail, or work off the fine (\$25.00 per day) in the Los Padres National Forest. In a few "hard core" cases I utilize the Probation Department to supervise the defendant's conduct.

A major concern I have relates to the fact that the majority of those defendants who elect to "work off" their fine are those who are not charged with the aggravated offenses. Usually they have camped in an undesignated area or entered a closed area, etc., and they are more or less the "good kids"; their offense was inadvertent or unintentional. I rarely receive these defendants back before me on a repeat offense. I do, however, receive an increasing number of defendants who are charged with, and ultimately found guilty of, aggravated offenses (destruction of public property, assault on Forest officers, use of narcotics, etc). We're now averaging seven trials per month and approximately 90 percent of the defendants are found guilty.

I can only conclude that the sentencing procedure which I have adopted is not serving a meaningful purpose as a deterrent, and that the law enforcement and Forest Service officers (and employees) concerned should, perhaps, make some recommendations to the Presiding Magistrate and to me personally on this subject.

¹ United States Magistrate, Santa Barbara, California.

I feel that we have reached a state where the "majority" of campers who use our back country are no longer the "good guys." I think that a majority, or at least a substantial minority, are "bad guys"; i.e., vandals and others who can only be properly discouraged by the establishment of an entrance and exit gate system with appropriate fees charged to absorb the administrative expense. We no longer live in a country with a substantial number of poor people. Almost every camper would be happy and able to pay a reasonable fee for use of nicely maintained camping and recreational facilities. The most important factor is that the campers' names and license numbers would be registered as they entered, and this, I believe, would discourage them from indulging in destructive activities.

One last important point is that I continually listen to the defendant relating "extenuating circumstances" that will, he hopes, soften the sentence to be imposed. Almost inevitably the defendant will state: "There wasn't any sign prohibiting nude swimming," or "We just pulled in to the camp and

didn't know that any fee was due," or "There was no sign showing this to be a closed area." I always advise them that it is their obligation to visit the nearest ranger station and ascertain the rules and regulations that govern the recreational use of the area and conduct themselves accordingly. This "sounds" good but in fact demonstrates that the Forest Service has insufficient funds and personnel to post these areas with appropriate signs containing the rules and regulations, whereas the camper who stops at a road stop gate can be immediately advised and will have little or no excuse for deviation from the said rules and regulations.

It is quite apparent that some changes must be made. I would strongly support the establishment of check stations and fee structures that would properly defray the overhead expenses, including the necessary assignment of local police and sheriff employees to these areas. Santa Barbara is fortunate in having good men available, but how long the County budget will be able to pay for their services is a matter of continual concern.

Creative Justice

Glenn Hampton¹

The subject I will briefly discuss is one we, as resource managers, have no control over but should have positive input to--the justice system. A number of years ago a very creative judge in Antelope Valley, California, initiated a Court Referral Program, by which persons guilty of certain misdemeanors were allowed to work off their sentences on the National Forest. The judge gave offenders three choices: pay a fine, go to the slammer, or work off their sentence in the adjacent Angeles National Forest. Most violators chose working in the National Forest.

The Court Crew Program started on the Valyermo District of the Angeles National Forest in 1964, when two high school boys who had chopped down an oak tree were sentenced to plant and water seedlings over their Christmas holiday. Both boys wrote to the

judge and thanked him for the fair sentence. Since that time, the program has saved taxpayers well over \$500,000 on this one Ranger District. This does not include dollars saved in reduced costs of maintaining penal inmates, or in such activities as fire prevention, resource management projects, and human resource rehabilitation. It also doesn't include dollars saved in other areas where the program is in progress. The most dramatic proof of its success lies in the fact that many other judicial districts throughout California are now in the program.

For years many jurisdictions were reluctant to employ the program because of the cloudy legal area of compensation for injuries. We've solved this problem with passage of the National Volunteer Act. All court crew personnel are now fully covered in case of an accident.

The accomplishments in environmental gains and overall improvements are numerous. Examples are reforestation, wildlife habitat improvement, fire prevention, road maintenance, trail construction, and campground construction and maintenance.

¹ District Ranger, Valyermo Ranger District, Angeles National Forest, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Pearblossom, California.

Although I've mentioned the dollar savings I think the real value of the program lies in the human values. Here are a few advantages of the program to the offender:

1. For an individual who is unable to pay a fine, it removes the burden and stigma of a jail sentence.

2. For young offenders, it takes the financial burden of paying a fine off the parents' shoulders and lets the offender serve his own sentence--thus teaching him personal responsibility. Many young people are exceptionally antagonistic toward the law enforcement agencies and officers. This program helps them to feel that law enforcement sees them as individuals, and that the system is not unfair or harsh with the first offender, who may have committed only a minor offense. Also, not being treated as a criminal sometimes helps put in check an otherwise rebellious young person.

3. Families already receiving County aid or some other form of public assistance need not further tax the public moneys by having a family member in jail.

4. The work accomplished is productive and important and the person doing the work knows he's doing something constructive. It often gives him a feeling of pride in accomplishment and strengthens his "work ethic."

5. The program allows people to work on their days off or vacation time, so that they are not in jeopardy of losing their livelihood.

The court crews have been a tremendous help in doing nontechnical tasks and freeing Forest Service personnel for more highly skilled and technical activities. When skilled people are sentenced they are fully utilized in projects needing carpenters, contractors, painters, etc.

There are also advantages to the community:

1. There is a minimum cost to maintain the program--clerical time at court and on the Forest district.

2. Instead of costing the County for a day in jail, the offender benefits the County and local community in labor for each day he works.

3. Every offender personally contributes his time to a constructive work project, thus compensating society for his offense.

4. The educational value of introducing the court crew member to the practice of con-

servation and expanding his environmental awareness is worth many times more than the project value.

Work accomplished by court crewmen does not duplicate and/or replace work contracted between Congress and the Forest Service. Permanent government employees are not replaced by court crewmen. Most of the work is resource-oriented work that must be accomplished in the years ahead.

The Court Referral Program is not an alternative to the rehabilitation of a convicted criminal. It is designed as a form of rehabilitation for misdemeanors. And as statistics point out, over and over again, most first-time youthful offenders are only guilty of a misdemeanor. All too often they feel they received a raw deal and a jail sentence only increases their bitterness. Or, their parents pay the fine and the young person goes free--free from financial and personal responsibility. Because we have long rejected the goal of retribution as a legitimate aim of the criminal law and of sentencing, the only remaining method by which the general public may be protected is the reformation of the individual offender into a law-abiding citizen.

The Court Referral Program has been in existence for 10 years. Returnees make up less than 5 to 10 percent. That's an outstanding record when compared to the national one. Many court referral people return, but as volunteers--to work on conservation projects with their four-wheel drive clubs, etc. This is a testimonial to the human value of the program.

Legally, the rational application of the doctrine of the "least drastic alternative" preserves both of the conflicting values: the need of society and the integrity of the Constitution. The United States Supreme Court has often used the phrase "less drastic means" in a First Amendment context.

It appears inevitable to me that courts ultimately will adopt, in one form or another, the doctrine of the "least drastic alternative." The doctrine is hardly extreme. The American Law Institute has recommended a presumption in favor of probation of every offender. The American Bar Association has declared that nonconfinement is to be preferred over total or partial confinement in the absence of affirmative reasons to the contrary.

All the National Forests and some of the Ranger Districts represented here today are located in communities where there are Municipal Courts. Go visit the judge or District Attorney or Magistrate and see if you can work out a Court Referral Program.

DESIGN AND VANDALISM



The Designer as the Vandal

Michael Morrissey¹

As our nation's population continues to increase and our cities become more overcrowded and impersonal, the desire to get away from it all and get back to nature becomes more and more important to everyone. Our increased affluence has directly affected our mobility and indirectly resulted in reduced time spent on the job. In recent years, we have been experiencing a trend toward shorter work weeks and longer annual vacations, enabling more people to travel further away from population centers and in larger numbers than ever before to outdoor recreation facilities. This available free time and new-found mobility now gives us more leisure time for outdoor recreation. A byproduct of this increase in people fleeing to the National Parks and Forest has been a steady rise in vandalism. The increase is partly due to overuse, to inadequate, improperly designed facilities, and to the ignorance or malice of the user.

The National Parks and National Forests do not in themselves contribute to these phenomena, but they directly suffer from it. They represent the authority and provide the essentials for an active vandalism program: soft workable material such as tree bark and picnic tables; and metal signs--excellent targets for the catchless hunter. The sign becomes the aggressor in the wilderness experience or even on a day hike. Recreationists go to a great deal of trouble and expense to remove themselves from their daily routine and surroundings. They are looking for a different experience--"nature." Man-made structures, of which the sign is an example, are all-too-familiar reminders of what they are trying to get away from--directives. Man-made structures in a natural setting are mutations, recognized by the visitor as targets to be shot at and defaced.

What is vandalism? Vandalism is destroying or defacing someone else's property. At publicly operated facilities, vandalism is the modification of a given object or landscape to suit the needs of the individual, be it for pleasure or purpose. Vandalism takes the form

of carving, burning, spray painting, littering, breaking, dismantling, or shooting. These acts are most often directed toward signs, trash cans, restroom facilities, and other man-made facilities. Frequently, nearby trees and vegetation are also the target of the vandal.

Vandalism is an act directed toward a particular object or serving to make a philosophical statement. If the act is committed against an object, then the object must be examined to determine the reason it is producing deviant behavior. The designer and managing agency are responsible for determining why the vandalism is occurring. This form of vandalism is agency/designer initiated, and can be reduced or eliminated when a method is implemented to identify and resolve the problem. The method is the development of a communication feedback system, one that will facilitate a dialog between the designer, management, and the recreational user. Because the user and operating agency are usually in direct contact with each other, a form of communication already exists--it is the designer who is usually isolated. Too often the designer's responsibility ends with the completion of construction.

Vandalism as a philosophical statement is a sociological problem. At best, the designer can only facilitate this type of activity or ignore it. The designer can not prevent sociological vandalism. When it is stopped in one place it usually appears in another.

If shot-up signs and toilet structures represent aggression and hostility directed at an authority, the parks and forests, and the government, then designing bullet-proof signs and toilet structures does not solve the initial problem. The vandal only moves on to more vulnerable targets or changes his style of vandalism.

Vandalism is also a form of communication. The vandal is saying to the designer, management, or even to society--"I don't like what you have done and I'm going to change it."

The people who rip off the top of the picnic table or the loose board on the storage

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Natural Resources, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California.

shed to build a campfire are not vandals. They are recreationists looking for firewood. What is a camping trip without a campfire? If a recreationist has to do this, then vandalism is purposeful and necessary, though purposeful only to the vandal.

Many generalizations could be made about who vandals are--teenagers, those people from the city, etc.--but this would serve no purpose in increasing understanding of the causes of vandalism for the designer. Each individual and type of vandal must be examined because vandalism is an act committed by individuals, not by a homogeneous group. On the other hand, there is one group of vandals who can be examined more closely than the others because we know more about them. They are the designers and planners of outdoor recreational facilities. Their selection of inappropriate material, their acceptance of poor construction and poor site design, and their misunderstanding of maintenance needs and durability has lead to a substantial amount of the damage called vandalism. Misunderstanding and ignorance on the part of the user and the operation and maintenance crews results in vandalizing of newly constructed facilities. The picnic table is an example. The vandal sees the wooden picnic table as a source of fire-

wood and a whittling block. The operator and maintenance crew feel the concrete picnic table solves many of the repair and maintenance problems created by the vandal. The designer searches for indestructible material that looks and feels like wood, but won't burn and can't be carved. Yet, all the recreationists wanted was a flat area to put their blanket on or a simple seating arrangement to keep them off the ground. At times, we have let the vandal become the designer and inadvertently the designer has become the vandal.

Where do we go from here? We must first accept that vandalism can not be stopped; it is here to stay. At best, we can only minimize the discomfort to the user and the cost of vandalism. We must recognize there is no absolute solution to vandalism. What appears as a solution in one situation, may not work in another.

One problem confronting National or State agencies is that each jurisdiction covers many different and varied types of subcultures, each one producing its own form of vandalism. The most practical path toward a solution to vandalism is to open communication between the designer, the operator, and, most important of all, the recreationist.

Control of Vandalism--An Architectural Design Approach

John Grosvenor¹

In discussing the Forest Service architectural design approach to vandalism in recreation structures, I will touch on three types of abuse. The most obvious is overt human actions, such as defacing buildings and breaking items. But there are also two additional types to consider. One is covert human actions--unthinking destruction and mistreatment of facilities, such as flushing down toilets objects that disrupt sewage septic action or plug the waste lines, pouring gasoline or other volatile liquids into vault toilets, or leaving doors or windows open to the elements to be damaged by wind, rain, snow and ice. The third type of vandalism is nonhuman damage created by natural agents, including water in its various forms, earthquakes, or various animals and birds.

The earliest Forest Service toilet structures were very primitive and simple, with rough sawn wood, concrete block, or stone masonry exteriors. The interiors were of similar character. Public use was low; therefore, vandalism was slight. After World War II and in the early 1960's, many more people were using National Forest campgrounds, and with this increase of usage came more vandalism. The architectural designs became larger and more sophisticated and the materials more finished, so that the repair costs of vandalism increased greatly. Attempts were made to use materials and finishes that might deter or stop abuse. These included plywood interior walls with joints sealed and flush, then painted with a two-part epoxy paint. Extra blocking and backing were added to toilet enclosures, doors, and windows, and details were simplified to keep repair costs down. Floors were treated with epoxy and exterior finishes were natural.

¹ Architect, California Region, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Pleasant Hill, California.

As we moved into the late 1960's, public usage was increasing even more, so even bigger and more complicated buildings were designed and constructed. We were still looking toward preventing overt vandalism in the designs and materials, but at this time we also began to face the other two types of vandalism. Oversized waste lines were put in to accommodate rocks, sanitary napkins, and plastic bags. The height and location of water closets and urinals for use by children and the handicapped were considered. Larger door closers were used to resist wind damage. Windows were eliminated and skylights or clearstories were added to bring in natural light. To provide heat to keep pipes from freezing in spring and fall, tamper-proof electric heaters were found. The type of glue used in the plywood, the species of trim, and the type of roofing materials were considered in areas where animal vandalism was prevalent (porcupines have eaten exterior plywood and woodpeckers have ruined trim and roofs.

As we entered the 1970's, the cost of maintenance and the amount of vandalism had again increased, together with the number of public users, to a point where new design approaches were needed. With the increased construction costs, we found it necessary to reduce the size of the buildings to stay within our budgets. About this time, we discovered that esthetics were a factor in deterring vandalism; more pleasing buildings, lighter interiors, and good quality materials seemed to keep the public from vandalizing our buildings. On the other hand heavy, dark, dank spaces seemed to increase public misuses. With the decrease in the size of the building and to keep the scale of the structure appropriate for the location, we tried turning the axis of our roofs 45°, giving us what we called the "handkerchief roof."

In 1972, the Forest Service began an extensive water-pollution abatement program, during which hundreds of old toilet buildings were replaced with modern sanitary structures. Again construction and maintenance costs were soaring much faster than money was becoming available. In order to better utilize the funds available, the concept of separate men's and women's toilets was dropped, and the water closets assigned to a campground were placed in separate cubicles, each with an exterior lockable door. Once more materials were carefully studied to give functional, attractive, easily maintained buildings. Split-faced concrete blocks with integral coloring selected for the specific campground was used for the exteriors. Easily cleanable interiors (factory-applied epoxy finish or ceramic tile) were chosen. The need for fragile toilet partitions was eliminated by the either-sex concept, and an easily accessible pipe chase also

held the electrical equipment and allowed space for storage of supplies. Interior lights were also placed in the pipe chase to keep public access down and reduce damage and theft. Exterior lights were specially designed for our buildings to be vandal-resistant. Floors were drained into the pipe chase with only one floor drain per building. Natural light was brought in through the roof to keep the interior of the buildings well illuminated. Ventilation was introduced at the top of the block walls, with closure panels to be installed in the winter. The designs were again moving towards the simple but rustic approach with heavy flat wood beam roofs and rough concrete block walls.

Up to this point, I have been talking only about toilet buildings, but the Forest Service has many other types of public use recreational structures. Our play structures are simple, rugged, and very natural. Native materials are used with natural finishes. The scale of these structures is designed for the users. We have had very little vandalism. Foot bridges in our campgrounds have been designed using low maintenance, damage-resistant materials, cor-ten steel open-web joists, heavy natural redwood handrails and decking, and exposed aggregate concrete abutments. Our designs for drinking fountains again are simple and natural, using heavy timber or stone pedestals and stainless steel bowls.

A fairly recent addition to our campground has been entrance stations. With these buildings we have tried to establish an architectural style for our campgrounds. They have been in character; therefore, we have used lexon-type plastic windows to deter vandalism, with shutters for the winter season. The materials have been rugged (heavy timber or concrete block) with natural finishes. Another new addition has been overlook structures along road systems and along reservoirs. These have been designed to invite people to use them, and have been open and clean to reduce vandalism. Again, natural finishes and vandal-resistant materials have been employed.

In our visitor center we have been aware of the possible effects of natural elements as well as human vandalism. Native stone, concrete, and heavy timber are used to create a building which is resistant to all three types of vandalism. Materials and design concepts have been used to create many structures which express a rustic bold character and invite the public to use them. Hopefully, the new designs will not only invite use, but vandalism-free use.

Design of Campground Facilities

Briar Cook¹

Why do people vandalize outdoor recreation sites--areas that have been designed for their enjoyment? Many reasons have been offered, and the following may be most applicable to recreation areas and facilities:

- a. Facilities are poorly maintained or improperly constructed;
- b. Attention-getting or competition is stimulated when some groups of people get together;
- c. Some people may have a bad feeling toward an organization and it is a form of "getting even;"
- d. Lack of activity in an area creates boredom;
- e. Some people simply get a kick out of destroying things.

The targets for vandalism in outdoor recreation areas usually include toilets, picnic tables, fire grates, garbage cans, buildings, and virtually any other object.

There is no possible way to anticipate or stop vandalism without an inexhaustible budget and staff. The best approach is to examine the most frequent vandalism occurrences and design facilities to help eliminate any recurrence or to lessen the extent of the vandalism.

The following recommendations are drawn from our recent work on toilet and table design.

VAULT TOILETS

Wherever possible, vault toilets should be converted to low-volume water or oil recirculation toilets. A booklet on maintenance and design of vault toilets is available from the author.

¹ Staff Engineer, Environmental, San Dimas Equipment Development Center, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, San Dimas, California.

Building Interior

The interior of the toilet building should be clean and odorless. This can be accomplished by proper venting, and by sealing concrete floors, using monolithic fiberglass interior liners, and using proper paints for the interior. The monolithic fiberglass interior liner is constructed much like a shower stall and is in one piece with the toilet riser built in. The toilet seat is similar to a household seat instead of a small metal camper-type seat. There are no cracks or sharp corners where debris can collect. Building design should allow for easy removal of damaged liners.

Paper dispensers should be designed to accommodate more than one roll of paper per toilet seat, depending on the frequency of maintenance visits. A two-roll dispenser or a simple locked bar that will accommodate many rolls, designed so the bar will not allow the paper to roll off easily, could be used.

All floor surfaces should be completely sealed to prevent staining and odor absorption and to make cleaning easier.

If lighting panels are used, they should be nonbreakable. Lights should be considered for night use, even if they have to be battery run.

Floor-level vents on two sides of the building are essential for ventilation and evaporation of cleaning water and urine deposits. These vents must be constructed of sturdy material in order to be vandal-proof. The screens should be located so as to prevent people from kicking them out. In a slump-stone building, place the screens between two decorative slump-stone blocks (blocks with many holes).

Building Exterior

Metal doors may prove more durable than wooden doors. Hydraulic door closures are being used to help prevent people from slamming doors.

All exterior concrete slabs and concrete

block or slump-stone should be sealed with a clear concrete sealer. This is to prevent paint from being absorbed into the block or slump stone, and to make its removal easier. If the concrete slab all around the building is sealed, stains will not be so noticeable when the interior is washed out or when the vault is pumped.

All signs should be securely bolted to the concrete block, slump-stone, or exterior wood frame.

Venting Techniques

Proper venting can by itself eliminate most odor problems during the use periods. The size of the vent should be the same as the accumulative size of the vault toilet riser openings. For every vault toilet seat, approximately 100 square inches of vent area is required. The vent should go from the vault through the building and terminate at the ceiling level. Insulation should be placed on the joists within the attic so that the heat generated in the attic will not permeate the use compartment. The roofing material and construction should be such as to induce solar heat into the attic. A vent, a little larger than the vent terminating at the ceiling level, should be constructed through the roof so that it is above the ridge height. This vent should be screened for flies.

The sun will heat the attic causing the hot air to rise, and air will be pulled down into the vault through the toilet seat. Thus, the odor in the use compartment will be eliminated. Some large rocks or other heat-absorbent material placed in the attic may keep this flow of air going on into the early evening.

A rain cap should be placed on the roof vent to keep water out of the attic. The bottom of the rain cap should be at least 3 inches above the top of the vent pipe so that the wind can flow easily between the two. The aspiration of the attic air due to wind is nearly as effective as the solar heat effect.

Vault Design

The vault should have an impermeable liner or container (either Hypalon or cross-linked polyethylene). It should be sloped 1 inch per foot from inside the building to outside, should be no greater than 4 feet deep, and should have a minimum 24-inch-diameter manhole cover on the outside of the building (to the rear or side).

Fiberglass, concrete, or steel should not be considered for the vault portion of the toilet unless the concrete is acting as a container for Hypalon or cross-linked polyethylene.

FLUSH TOILETS

Building Interior

Wall-hung urinals should be adjusted so that both children and adults can use them. Floor-mounted units satisfy all needs. Partitions next to urinals should be designed to withstand the corrosive effect of urine.

If water closets for the handicapped are used, a regular one should be installed also. Children and small adults have a hard time using the water closets for the handicapped.

No wood paneling should be adjacent to the water closets or urinals because users will carve on them. All floors should be heavily sealed to prevent absorption of odors and to make cleaning easier.

All faucets should be foot or knee operated, with 1 gallon per minute flow control devices placed in the lines. This will prevent a great deal of cleanup maintenance by keeping the bowls and fixtures cleaner. Paper dispensers should be designed for more than one roll.

The interior should be well lighted and easily cleaned.

Building Exterior

The material used on the exterior should be functional, locally available, and inexpensive. The privacy screens should be primarily functional, rather than esthetic. If concrete or slump-stone is used, it should be sealed with a concrete sealer.

PICNIC TABLES

Fiberglass picnic tables or covers for existing wood tables can be made to very closely resemble wood, to be heat resistant, and to resist carving with knives. The fiberglass helps prevent food from being absorbed into the surface of the existing wood tables and presents a cleanable surface: a damp cloth will clean off most normally present food remains.

In conclusion, all designs should be geared toward the conditions in a given area rather than to satisfy a designer's ego.

Design vs. Vandalism

Arthur C. Danielian¹

Public schools, civic centers, public libraries, youth activity and recreation centers, and other public-use facilities in urban or suburban places are designed by architectural firms in the private sector for various governmental agencies. Each project is designed in response to criteria, including budget limitations, developed by the administrative agency. The architect, during the design process on all types of buildings, must maintain a proper perspective and sensitivity with respect to numerous design considerations, including vandalism. The level or priority of the design criterion related to the durability or indestructibility of a structure must be weighed carefully. Nothing prevents the architect from designing completely indestructible buildings, other than his desire to satisfy more heavily weighted considerations and budget restraints.

Good architecture is the proper blending of basic considerations of function, economics, and esthetics. In the absence of concern for economics, for instance, the designer might produce a piece of sculpture, not architecture. In establishing priorities or placing emphasis on any particular design consideration, whether it be concern for vandalism or concern for delicate design, the architect must be aware of these underlying influences related to the urban-setting:

Social-economic conditions

Age of community

Relative crime rate and trends

Attitudes and values of the people

Density or the level of community anonymity and

Existing level and respect of urban quality.

The relative strengths of these elements have important influence on the design. The

architectural solution for a new teen center in an old and economically deteriorated community with high vandalism rates will be quite different from one designed for a new community whose crime rate and related costs are not as sensitive issues. Similarly, a toilet facility located in wildland areas, where the effects of vandalism absorb perhaps 60 percent of the operating budget, is likely to require far more concern for durability than a teen center in a new suburban community where vandalism might account for less than 3 percent of the operating budget.

Too often, buildings are designed with little or no respect to considerations of life cycle vs. initial cost. For example, the cost to maintain a public school over its life span of 50 years is some 10 times its initial construction cost; yet in most cases, the budgets established for such structures preclude the use of optimum quality materials, which may cost more initially but in the long haul save substantially more. Budgets for buildings, especially high-public-use structures, should be determined from life cycle studies, not by arbitrary limits. The architect working with his client can most effectively establish the appropriate budget for any given project during the initial or conceptual phase of design.

Let us examine a few good and bad concepts of site planning, architectural design material specifications, and landscape design, to highlight problems of vandalism and some potential solutions.

Older communities, especially in deteriorated and abandoned areas, become attractive nuisances or targets for vandals. Conversely, in lively areas, where multiple activities involve people, the people themselves become natural deterrents to acts of mischievous vandalism.

It's unfortunate that some magnificent public spaces, such as the Santa Ana Civic Center, are planned for shamefully limited use. These vast-scale and richly developed urban spaces are used only during normal working hours. A mixture of public, quasi-public, and private commercial uses could have enhanced and expanded the use activities into

¹ President, Danielian, Moon, Ilg and Associates, Architects/Planners, Newport Beach, California.

the evening and weekend periods. The provincial attitudes of governmental agency planners are responsible for such shortcomings in many urban places. Programing and planning of such centers, as well as smaller-scale government improvements, should be handled more creatively and with input from the private sector to promote more interest and vitality, lessen tactical vandalism (demonstrative type), and maximize returns on public investment.

Vandalism could be deterred in many public or private developments, such as schools, if more design consideration were given to building arrangements, court yards fencing, and screenwalls. A good example is the intermediate school, where a single, self-contained structure with only four entry points can reduce problems associated with vandalism. All entry points were exposed to natural surveillance. Once in the building, secondary entry doors are used to separate evening public use facilities, such as an auditorium, from internal use areas, such as the administrative offices and cafeteria. With a reduced number of entry points, with easy visual and physical access, and with no exterior windows, a school will experience less vandalism, require less maintenance, and be more productive on less land. Another example of good planning is the introduction of semi-interior courts which can be closed off at need with a well-designed rolling fence. Vertical bar spacing should be close enough to prohibit a child from squeezing through but maintain a sense of visual openness to attractively landscaped areas. Again, the concept of natural visual surveillance is retained.

The importance of good surveillance cannot be overemphasized. Entry areas, especially those of public buildings, can best be controlled when they are oriented to public view from the outside, or to a receptionist's or director's view from the inside. An obscure or shielded entry area becomes an attractive nuisance in the dark. Another technique to discourage vandalism is induced self-restraint by threat or intimidation. Just as department and grocery stores have one-way glass at strategic points, a dark glass window on a structure adjacent to an outdoor recreation area such as a swimming pool or tennis court can have psychological effect in giving potential vandals the sense of being watched.

In general circulation areas, traffic can be directed or discouraged by creating a sense of private territorial domain. The use of wing walls, change of levels, barrier-type landscape treatments or textures can subtly separate adjoining public and private spaces without overuse of walls or other imposing structures. Most architects have a good understanding of human behavior, and through

relatively simple applications of design concepts can direct the movement of people and minimize their interest in adjoining spaces not intended for public use.

Wall surfaces are one of the favorite attractions of vandals. Some communities have serious problems with graffiti. Graffiti is a form of social protest, and fairly typical in communities where socio-economic conditions have been allowed to deteriorate and where recreational opportunities are inadequate. Wall surfaces can frequently be protected from becoming attractive nuisances. Separating walls from public walkways with landscaping and utilizing textured surfaces like split-face masonry are only two ideas. Sealing the surfaces of textured walls will usually reduce the effort needed to remove aerosol markings without sandblasting. Durability of vertical surfaces, especially around entry ways, should receive special attention in design.

Finally, greenbelt and parking-lot lighting is important. A well-lit parking lot is subject to a minimum of vandalism and crime. Also, from a marketing point of view, a parking lot associated with a structure designed for night use but not illuminated is inadvisable because it will tend to keep patrons away, especially women.

Following are some predesign and design considerations that may prove helpful to agency administrators faced with problems of vandalism and seeking sound solutions through effective site and facility design.

General Predesign Considerations

Procedure for Selecting Architects--Agencies should not make selections on the basis of low bid. Rather, several architects who have demonstrated competence and sensitivity to good design should be solicited for proposals, and a personal interview should be held. Fees should be negotiated after the most appropriate architect is selected. (Many agencies are already using this approach.)

Design Criteria or Program--Rigid criteria can stifle an imaginative solution. General criteria expressed in terms of desired performance rather than specification will yield superior solutions. Final budgets should be confirmed by the architect early in the design development.

Comprehensive Team Approach--In addition to the architect, other required consultants must be carefully selected. The qualification and experience of the design team, their approach to design, their ability to work together, and current work loads should be considered. The architect is normally the most

appropriate person to organize and coordinate the total team. A flow chart is a very effective way to analyze, distribute and coordinate the preconstruction activities. It encourages a comprehensive recognition of the problems, arranges for orderly and timely inputs and maximizes the effectiveness of the program.

Site and Building Design Considerations to Minimize Vandalism and Crime

Parking Next to Buildings--Parking of vehicles against or adjacent to a building is not recommended. Vehicles act as screens to hide behind and are closer for get-away purposes.

Parking Lot Lighting--Good lighting layout, well spread throughout the lot, discourages parking in dark areas by would-be vandals or criminals.

Security Lighting Around Buildings--Good lighting all around the buildings is the best investment. A well-lighted building discourages attempts at unlawful activities.

Lighting at Vulnerable Points--If total lighting around entire building is not affordable, then lighting should be concentrated at least around exterior openings, such as entry doors, windows, intake/exhaust louvers, grills, panels, ladders, etc.

Security Fences--Fences 8 feet high and gates fabricated from metal or masonry are desirable between the parking lot and the building. Fences and walls are additional physical barriers to overcome. Lighting should be located along these fences. Open-type ornamental iron or chain-link fences are desirable because they allow visibility.

Appurtenances Around the Building--Storage areas, trash enclosures, lean-to's, or other such appurtenances near or adjacent to buildings should be kept to a minimum: they are potential hiding places and encourage vandalism.

Doors--Exterior doors should be solid-core material or hollow metal, set in heavy-duty wood or metal frames. Doors should be equipped with nonremovable hinges. Glass in aluminum doors should be well lit.

Locks--Generally, heavy-duty locks with a long bolt through them should be used. Dead bolts on the inside of doors should be used where feasible and legal.

Sound Alarm Devices--Sound alarm devices on exterior doors can be used. Unauthorized personnel without keys cannot open doors without tripping the sound alarm.

Window Frames--Heavy-gauge aluminum window frames are recommended. Jalousie (slatted louvers) windows are an invitation to a burglar.

Plastic vs. Glass Windows--Almost indestructible, clear plastic material, which comes in various sizes and thicknesses, is available. Cost, however, is higher (about 75 to 100 percent) than that for glass. Unless absolutely necessary, plastic glazing should not be used at eye level (because of distortion) or at a level of physical reach (because it is easily stretched). For clearstory glazing it is excellent.

Ladders--Exterior ladders attached to buildings for access to the roof should be well lit. Unless required by code, interior ladders are preferable. Ladders in general are attractive nuisances.

Security Bars/Grills--Roof openings and access points should be equipped with security bars and grills. Cost is nominal and savings could be substantial. Keep in mind, however, that these devices can also create entrapments for people inside a burning building.

Surveillance Systems--These systems are gaining popularity and newer and more effective systems are constantly being developed for the consumer. Costs are coming down, as competition is keen, but the cost of a system usually depends on its degree of sophistication and the number of openings or areas it covers.

Conclusion and Overview

In conclusion, it is apparent that the architect cannot eliminate vandalism; he can, however, through design, influence the behavior patterns of people who utilize spaces, indoors or outdoors, day or night.

Generally, the problems existing in our wildland areas are no different from those in our more urban areas. Inadequate revenues to public agencies offset the increased demands for expansion, redevelopment, and upkeep; the need for increased services; and inadequate general plans are the major stumbling blocks. These problems can no longer receive the "band-aid" treatment, as evidenced by more and more urban failures. The time has come when we must now focus on comprehensive planning if we are serious about resolving our current and future problems. The planning process would include analyzing the long-range needs, evaluating our physical potential, considering the continual need to improve the quality and longevity of our natural wildland areas, and realistically reconciling financial requirements with programmed revenues, public and private.

Preventive Planning to Reduce Vandalism

H. Ernest Reynolds¹

The widespread and growing problem of vandalism can only be solved if we make dramatic changes in our planning process. The old approaches are not working, so let's think creatively toward a new approach.

Our firm is currently compiling the results of a questionnaire sent to park directors in selected cities and counties throughout California. So far we've had a 30 percent response, which is fantastic. It shows the intense interest in park financing, maintenance, and operation. The preliminary data also show the increasing problem of vandalism.

Parks have been a very important part of my entire life. I've worked in them, played in them, planned them, and devoted years to discovering ways to make them serve the public better while at the same time preserving environmental values. It's because of my sincere personal and professional interest that I value this opportunity to share 10 ideas for reducing park vandalism.

1--Identify your vandal. Remember that your vandal is also your park user. Who are the groups who desecrate our parks? Have you ever tried to identify them? I know from my experience that some of these are interest groups we have ignored over the years. There probably isn't any park manager who hasn't turned his back on permitting two-wheeled bikes, four-wheeled off-landers, skateboarders, hang gliders, gun clubs, even nudies from using our parks. Perhaps some of the vandalism is due to the people that we have kept out of our parks. We should ask ourselves whom we have left out and why.

How would you feel as an urban resident if you arrived at a remote campground and you found the same system used as in the super market checkout stand to gain access to a camping spot? Then, to make it worse, you found that the camping area was designed for a different type of camping vehicle from yours. What thoughts run through your mind when you go into a camp area planning to gather wood for fire and you find out that it is not

allowed? You probably end up driving to the general store and paying a fancy price for charcoal briquettes. Might the thought just run through your mind that you would sneak out into the woods and collect some wood for your fire? And thereby be considered a vandal?

Let's take another example in an urban park. The Planning Department of a city decides that a particular area should be mainly inexpensive homes with three or four bedrooms. This means that there will be many mothers and tots. This further means that the community park will likely be designed specifically for these users. What happens to the 11- to 15-year olds? If you have ever had any children of junior high school age, I think you'll agree that they are the most active and orneriest group imaginable. Yet, we plan our parks so that they have little appeal to this group during the daytime. Instead, they gather in groups at night, where the temptation is great to show off their budding maturity by acts of vandalism.

Aren't we as planners, foresters, and park officials often guilty of laying the groundwork for park vandalism? Think about it.

2--Listen to the land. Before putting your pencil to paper, get to know the land you are working with. If it is a wilderness or forest land, sleep with it. Know every tree, rock outcropping, drainage channel, and view by heart. Know the soil, rainfall, vegetation, and compaction and erosion potential. Identify views, amenities, and features on a base map and superimpose all elements of importance until the usable landforms stand out clearly. Also, consider the less obvious concerns, such as noise, wind, light patterns from passing vehicles, etc.

3--Listen to the people. When was the last time you went out into the park and talked to the people using it? There may be a few of you who do this routinely, but I doubt it. And yet, unless we get from behind our desks to talk with men, women, and children deriving benefits from our parks, all our planning and operation philosophy is really theoretical rather than actual. I think you must realize

¹ Reynolds and Associates, Environmental Analysis Foundation, Newport Beach, California.

that the vandal is not just another "turkey" from the city, but a person with needs that are not being satisfied in our parks at the present time. Oh, yes, there are some vandals who just don't know any better or they have destructive tendencies because of a psychological problem. But I'm not really talking about them. I'm talking about the person who vandalizes because he is angry. Angry because he feels that he has been left out. There is much that you and I can do, not just to hear what people think about our parks, but to listen to their needs. There is a difference. Hearing is merely the physical act of receiving a sound, whereas listening implies understanding.

4--Kick your planner. Be sure your planner is awake--get him out of his office--before, during, and after the park project. Encourage him to try new communication techniques and workshop processes. Send him to conferences and allow him to work with other professionals. Be sure the planner knows all the operation and maintenance problems. Have him spend a week with a crew, or find ways he can improve operations through design. But most important, be sure he is awake--and learning everything he can about your agency and its problems. The planner is the man in the middle. He should be getting feedback from the bottom up and from the top down. Unless he gets this, he cannot be effective. If you use outside consultants, kick them harder. They need to get more feedback from more people in less time in order for them to offer added value. Don't be afraid to mix outside consultants with staff on a given assignment. The competition and interaction can do wonders for both. Tremendously effective problem solving can be accomplished in short periods of time from this synergism.

5--Throw out the budget. "Cheap is the vandal's meat." The budget--often broken apart and allocated before any of the above steps have been taken--becomes a catalyst to vandalism. First, relate what you found out from the land to the needs of the user. See if the site is adequate, whether boundaries need adjustment, whether the capacity to accommodate exists. If the answers are affirmative, then prepare at least three to five alternative concepts, any of which could be a solution. A word of caution: don't confuse variations on a theme with alternatives.

At this point, you should prepare a composite plan or synthesis. Evolve it using the workshop planning process. Based on this "best" concept, now do a cost estimate and budget related to the life of the facility.

6--Burn your standards. Most equipment standards and most catalogs are out of date.

The equipment is static, often understressed, and has limited life. I am disheartened at the trend toward fiberglass equipment. My experience has shown this material to be highly susceptible to early aging and changes. Avoid it wherever possible, and instead build stronger and longer-lasting facilities--better culverts, restrooms, and community buildings. Don't hesitate to be a pioneer. I say this because in all sincerity I feel that it is up to the planner and designer to be the source of new ideas. We should be the ones telling the manufacturers what we need and what we want for long-range park usage. The manufacturer and the workmen all look to the designer for guidance. If we don't provide this, then we deserve the second-rate equipment and materials we now have.

7--Design for the centuries (not 1980). So many things seem to have a lifespan related to man's own; not so a park. Parks remain--they often last for centuries, and should. So will our public lands and remote areas, if history is correct.

The question is what do we do with a parcel of land that will be here for centuries, but which is part of a 1980 recreation plan. Well, I believe we must design for the longer period of time. We need heavier construction; greater strength, durability, and usability; and less intensive use, but more durable elements. We also need more sites with fewer, better placed, and more durable picnic and camping spaces. Each planner should ask himself what his solution will be like in 20 to 50 years rather than 5 years from the date of completion.

So what about materials? Vandals destroy everything in sight if a park is not policed.

In designing for the next century, we recommend a return to stone and other masonry, reinforced concrete, and hardwoods, as well as wood-imprinted concrete. We suggest fewer man-made elements, not more. Fewer signs, but better detailed; fewer log curbs, and no fiberglass any place. We suggest reinforced concrete restrooms built into the hillside--opening only on one side--and that side to public view.

What about policing at night? We suggest that County government, for example, use County parks for fire station sites, particularly when gated park entries are impractical. This would place people and light within the park 24 hours a day. It is also a cost-effective decision, in that fire stations are otherwise placed on expensive land, purchased for a single use. Fire stations themselves can then be multi-purpose park structures and enclose a park office, public restrooms, library, post

office, etc. We can no longer afford single-use, single-agency, single-purpose thinking. For multi-purpose structures we can afford vandal-resistant materials. Similarly, parking and other facilities should serve multiple users.

I think we are making unhappy users, and hence more vandals, because of the current trend to a planning policy of keeping campers close together, with spaces more compact for control and less damage to the forest area. Theoretically, it provides more safety, less policing, etc. This to me is a formula for disaster. Too many people, overuse, small spaces, too many controls, fiberglass benches, catalog fireplaces, and regimentation cause stress, just as too much noise, light, smoke, dust, etc. result in complaints.

A low-density campground, open and well spaced, with free areas and fewer controls will result in a better long-ranged facility--and allow flexibility for future adjustments.

I believe strongly that overcrowding in forest and park campgrounds is the cause of the worst vandalism of all--penetration and destruction of the "back country" by those still seeking to get away for a while. We must provide that escape through planning present spaces better.

8--Experience the errors. One serious mistake we designers make is that we do not go back and experience our errors. We also make a lot of unnecessary excuses. We're human and we are learning as we go. We become accessories to vandalism, however, by not revisiting the work that we have designed. We should return to the park and actually camp out. Mingle with the users. Observe. Ask questions. Certainly the users will appreciate the expressed interest. Besides, we may learn something.

9--Correct your problems--be innovative. Once problems and errors (new and old) have been identified, be aggressive and innovative in solving them. Don't go on the premise, "Well, we missed on that one; we'll not do the same thing next time," and then leave the problems unresolved. Instead, let me tell you what I think is an innovative approach that involves budgeting for innovation.

How can you innovate? By borrowing a technique used in progressive industrial organizations. They too set up budgets for capital investment, operation, maintenance, etc. But they go one step further. They set aside funds for cost-effective design research. We can use the same technique, but with a minor variation. Instead of each individual city or county bearing the total cost of this program, agencies and counties should get together with others having common needs. Set up a pool of funds for test sites and learning workshops.

10--Communicate through graphics. Last, but extremely important--communicate informal-

ly and concisely through graphics. Using pages and placards full of rules summarized in penalties is offensive communication. One would not do that to a guest in his home. I advocate simple, clear, friendly graphics that exude a welcome. Remember, the user still feels the pinch of financing public works, so he views public land as "his" space. This should be emphasized in all agency policies. In fact, if the user realizes he paid for it, he may respect it more. To be greeted with a penalty clause at the front door and rules of use seems to be poor public relations. Admittedly, this view is oversimplified, but the message given the public is extremely important; and it is often the very first impression received by the park user. Funds spent on professional graphics, concepts, and communication techniques are usually not wasted--nor is the time spent on a warm welcome.

SUMMARY

We planners are partly responsible for vandalism--and vandals are people, users whose needs are not met.

Decreased vandalism will result from providing facilities that are rugged--yet satisfy all age levels in a friendly, uncrowded atmosphere.

Facilities must relate to the site in a functional yet sensitive manner, with an understanding of the holding capacity of the site.

Budgets and standards need to change in their relative importance, and research funds must be used in case studies.

Overuse is an extreme threat in the future, and crowding will cause stress and result in greater problems than can be easily solved.

And last, each planner has many choices to make, and lots of room for growth to improve his designs--it's a much broader question than new coatings and finishes--it's prevention through process-oriented design...and most eyes are on the planner.

REFERENCES

- Newman, Oscar
1972. Defensible space. The MacMillan Company, New York. 264 p., illus.
- Sommer, Robert
1969. Personal space, the behavioral basis of design. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 177 p., illus.
- Proshansky, H. M., W. H. Ittelson, and L. G. Rivlin, editors
1970. Environmental psychology: man and his physical setting. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York. 690 p., illus.

SOCIOLOGY OF VANDALISM



Photo: East Bay Regional Park District



Research to determine the kinds of recreational opportunities desired by different groups can help to ensure that varying cultural needs are satisfied.

Vandals Aren't All Bad

Michael L. Williams¹

Vandalism is one of many diverse activities in the broad category of criminal behavior. For sociological analysis, then, both criminal behavior and vandalism must be defined.

Any behavior in violation of the criminal law is criminal behavior. If there is no statute covering such behavior, there can be, given our constitution, no violation of the criminal law. Of course, practically speaking, matching statutes with concrete behavior is not always a simple task. However, that is not our problem.

Vandalism is somewhat more difficult to define. If we turn to the penal code we find that there is no such offense as "vandalism," though the definition of "malicious mischief" closely corresponds to a commonsense definition of vandalism. "Malicious mischief" is, simply, the malicious or intentional injury to or destruction of real or personal property by someone other than the owner. The law, though, tells us nothing about how and why people engage in acts of malicious mischief or vandalism.

There are several related issues here:

1. Acts of vandalism do not differ qualitatively from other types of human behavior.
2. Acts of vandalism occur in the course of or as the results of social interaction.
3. The creation of laws and administrative rules (as in national, state, and local parks and recreation areas) serves to focus both official and public attention on the vandalism problem.

The first point, then, is that acts of vandalism do not differ qualitatively from other types of human behavior. Emile Durkheim²

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Maine, Portland-Gorham.

² Durkheim, Emile
1933. On the division of labor in society. Macmillan.
1938. The rules of the sociological method. Free Press, New York.

an early but influential sociologist, noted that crime was a normal feature of a complex society. Crime, moreover, had a positive function in that detection and punishment of violators served to reinforce collective belief in the social system and its values.

Although it is difficult to condone carving one's initials on a picnic table, spray-painting a rock or tree, plugging up the plumbing in a restroom, or dumping over trash cans, we nonetheless enshrine similar assaults on our environment when perpetrated by a historical figure or an ancient unknown, or when the act itself reinforces a collective or national consciousness. Thus, when an enterprising hotel proprietor pushed some burning embers over the top of Glacier Point in Yosemite, a tradition was begun that lasted over seventy-five years and was halted not because it was wrong in principle, but because it was causing a massive traffic jam and law enforcement problems. In the same National Park, someone actually carved a tunnel through a Giant Sequoia. Until the tree fell down a few years ago, this was another highlight of a trip to Yosemite. Today we attempt to preserve the acts of Indians who defaced the walls of caves hundreds of years ago, an act that, if done today in the same location, would result in prosecution if the culprit could be caught. Finally, let us not forget the grandest act of all. First conceived in the early 1920's, Mount Rushmore, with the faces of Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Roosevelt, is undoubtedly one of the most revered examples of the sanctioned destruction of the public domain.

The question, then, is what distinguishes these acts from the senseless destruction and defacement normally associated with vandalism? The only response that I can defend is that none of the last described acts were violations of the law at the time they were committed. It should be noted that the exact nature of the act did not go unnoticed by the proponents of the "creation of a symbol of the national spirit." For work to go ahead on Mount Rushmore, both State and Federal legislation had to be enacted. Otherwise, by law the sculpting would have constituted the intentional destruction and defacement of the

natural environment. Each of these acts, though, were completely legal at the time they were actually undertaken.

Yet if I maintain that the only distinction between vandalism and nonvandalism is that the destruction or defacement of property is illegal, then I am asserting that destroying a restroom is qualitatively the same as destroying "an old park headquarters" to make way for the new, or that carving one's initials on a tree is merely a small-scale version of what logging operations do to forests, namely deface and/or destroy. Clearly there is a difference, albeit a culturally defined difference. Namely, one class of activity is of direct economic importance and the other is not. Another way of stating the distinction is that one class of activity has utility but the other does not. The reason the distinction is merely cultural is that our culture readily provides us with a rationale for the destruction that necessarily accompanies logging operations, whereas we are usually hard put to discover logical reasons for the seemingly wanton destruction of property that we call vandalism.

Recently, however, sociologists³ have noted, based on limited data, that such "senseless" and apparently nonrational vandalism is, from the point of view of the perpetrator, a rational and instrumental act. To return to the main point then: vandalism is not qualitatively different from other types of social action. It is clear from my perspective that there are many, many examples of destructive activity which differ from those acts we refer to as vandalism only in that they are not violations of the law. And if the law is the only distinction one can make, then it is likely that from time to time the law will be violated.

The second point I would like to address

³ Clinard, Marshall B., and Andrew L. Wade
1958. Toward the delineation of vandalism as a sub-type in juvenile delinquency. *J. Crim. Law, Criminol. and Police Sci.* 48:493-499.

Cohen, Albert

1955. *Delinquent boys*. Free Press, New York.

Cohen, Stanley

1973. Property destruction: motives and meanings. p. 23-53. In *Vandalism*. Colin Ward, editor. Architectural Press, London.

Wade, Andrew L.

1967. Social processes in the act of juvenile vandalism. In *Criminal behavior systems*. Marshall B. Clinard and Richard Quinney, editors. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York.

is the assertion that acts of vandalism occur in the course of social interaction. Wade³ has similarly noted, "...In actuality much property destruction by juveniles is a spontaneous outgrowth of group interaction having social, cultural and ecological determinants." Because vandals are seldom apprehended in the act, it is easy to suppose that the culprit was acting as an individual--a supposition which, of course, reduces the visibility of social interaction. However, the research of Wade and Stanley Cohen³ indicates that "vandalism is almost always a group rather than an individual offense."

It is this point, that vandalism most often is a group offense and occurs as the result of interaction between group members, that remains remarkably unexplored by sociologists.⁴ By illustrating the interaction which accompanies acts of vandalism, the similarity between vandalism and other action, such as play, will be illustrated as well. Two examples immediately come to mind where the play situation merges with activity that could be defined as vandalism.

The first was provided by a colleague. When he was a boy back in Minnesota he went hunting with a friend. On the day in question, though, game was not to be found. Not a shot was fired until one youth challenged the other, "Bet you can't hit that glass thing up there." The other boy could, and the rest of the day was spent shooting glass insulators off power poles.

The other case that comes to mind dates from my own boyhood. Once, I and the other neighborhood children of the postwar baby boom were engaged in our usual after-school dirt clod battle. This afternoon, though, we drifted into an orange grove. As might be expected, dirt clods quickly gave way to oranges as symbolic missiles of destruction. It was not until a mother, unfortunately mine, looking for her wayward son, discovered the battle that it was brought to a conclusion.

In both examples the destruction which occurred was largely incidental to the act. Insulators were shot as demonstrations of marksmanship rather than objects of destruction. Oranges served as missiles rather than objects to be destroyed. In addition, these particular acts were not solitary but occurred

⁴ Instead they have focused on the epidemiology of vandalism. Much has been written about the sociocultural variables associated with vandalism but little about the act of vandalism itself. See:

Bates, William, and Thomas McJunkins

1962. Vandalism and status differences. *Pac. Socio. Rev.* 2:89-92.

in the course of interaction between two or more persons. By interaction I do not mean to infer that extensive discussion must preface any act of vandalism. Interaction simply means the communication of information. Thus, in the first case the dare or "bet" constitutes a tentative proposal for action. The actual shooting of the insulator, then, reaffirms the proposal as being appropriate. Similarly, throwing an orange can notify other participants of a new missile. Again the response to the initiation of the act of vandalism reaffirms the behavior as appropriate in that situation.

One need not propose, then, that juveniles who engage in such behavior are deficiently socialized or are bad kids. In fact, if confronted with examples of good behavior and bad, I would expect the children would know the difference and would choose to act out "good" behavior over "bad," at least in the abstract. But the point is that in the real, concrete situations children and adults must confront, "good" and "bad" are seldom so clearly distinguishable.

Neither should the above examples be taken to indicate that only juveniles engage in acts of vandalism. Adults have been known to carve their initials in tables, tear limbs off trees for campfire wood, and drive four-wheel-drive vehicles in a manner which is destructive to terrain. Each act, in its context, can be normalized, and, like the acts of juveniles, usually occurs as the result of interaction with others. Thus, when on patrol with a Deputy Sheriff I observed the following incident:

A four-wheel-drive pickup with roll bars and extra lights was stuck in the middle of a large, muddy bog in a field. When the Deputy asked what happened, the owner said, "We were just driving around and he said, (pointing to another man) 'Let's go through that field.' So I did." When the Deputy said, "Don't you know this is private property?" the man lamely said, "I didn't think it would hurt anything."

Though vandalism is frequently normal activity or an extension of normal activity, play, and though it is usually (according to the limited research) a group rather than a solitary phenomenon, the possibility remains that it is solitary. Thus, property may be destroyed or defaced as a form of retaliation or retribution, especially when a person perceives that he or she is impotent to bring about a legitimate solution to a problem or conflict with another. The person who plans and is bent on such an act is, of course, difficult to foil because (1) he develops a plan, and (2) he perceives he has a moral or just reason for

his indignation. Fired employees or persons prevented from entering a park (for whatever reasons) may perceive that they have been treated unfairly and seek to retaliate for the wrong they have suffered. Though this type of act seems to be qualitatively different from those which occur as an extension of play, there is no need to assume that it cannot be conceived of as normal or that it occurs in the absence of interaction with others. First, many people retaliate every day in little ways against persons (husbands, wives, or close friends, etc.) who have "done them wrong." So the mere act of retaliation is not, intrinsically, abnormal. Likewise, because the actual retaliatory act may be the work of a solitary individual, there is no reason to assume that a good deal of interaction did not precede it. It is easy to conceive of a situation in which others convince a person that he has been unjustly treated and provide him with a course of action.

It has been asserted that play and retaliatory acts are normal aspects of everyday life. In addition, vandalism occurs as the result of interaction between two or more individuals. When they jointly engage in acts of vandalism, the interaction is fairly obvious. However, even solitary acts of vandalism are probably preceded by interaction. In short, it appears that when one focuses on the actual act of vandalism and the interaction which precedes such acts rather than the products of vandalism, apparently senseless destruction is not different from any other social action.

This assertion returns our focus to administrative rules and laws which serve to distinguish vandalism from other categories of social action. Earlier I asserted that "the creation of laws and administrative rules serves to focus both official and public attention on the vandalism problem." They do so in two ways. For example, a few years ago a back-country survey in Yosemite noted that there were literally hundreds of fire rings around one of the Cathedral Lakes. This and similar findings led to the development of a policy which restricts the use of campfires in the back country to a limited number of campsites. In addition, an attempt was made to break up many fire rings and a policy was implemented which allowed fires only in previously constructed fire rings.

This example illustrates that a problem was recognized that resulted from legitimate but unwise or at least unesthetic actions of previous backpackers and horsepackers. Creation of the rules which restricted locations where campfires could be built and specified that they were to be built only in previously constructed fire rings constitutes an ex post

facto recognition that such acts constitute vandalism in the form of defacing the natural environment. These rules then call attention to the vandalism problem. But they do more. To the extent that the locations of existing fire rings and legitimate locations for campfires is known to officials, construction of campfires in other than prescribed locations constitutes a persistent vandalism problem that could not exist before the enactment of the rules. A second consequence of the new rules certainly was not intended by park officials but occurs nevertheless. Because there are relatively few locations where campfires are allowed, backpackers and horsepackers tend to congregate in those locations. Firewood soon becomes scarce and campers, expecting to have a fire but frustrated in their search for fuel, frequently lift their eyes skyward to still standing trees, both living and dead, as sources of fuel. As a result of this, I have seen a magnificent, knarled old snag reduced to little more than a great stump.

Thus, there are two ways in which the creation of rules and laws in turn creates and focuses attention on vandalism. The first is simply by labeling previously legitimate behaviors as rule violations--vandalism; the second is by placing those people who attempt to act in compliance with certain laws and rules in a situation that is conducive to their violation of other laws and rules.

It should be clear that acts of vandalism cannot be easily controlled by those who are handed this task. Yet we can take a cue from the previous discussion to find a possible solution.

Consequences

The consequence of the point made that vandalism is normal or, at least, an outgrowth of normal, legitimate activity is that we can expect that, despite efforts to control or eliminate vandalism, it will persist.

The second point, that vandalism occurs in the course of or as a result of social interaction, provides some hope for limited control of the vandalism problem. The solution lies in an attempt to gain control or interaction settings.

Many methods may be utilized. Some, such as education, are not directly related to the actual situations in which vandalism is likely

to occur. Other methods, such as design, may be utilized to affect physical settings in such a way as to minimize vandalism. Proactive methods--programed activity--may be employed to channel park and recreation area users into nondestructive courses of action or even behaviors which benefit the recreational setting. Finally, reactive methods in the form of a traditional law-enforcement program, may, from time to time, be the only solution to acute vandalism problems.

Finally, as a consequence of the third point, that the creation of laws and administration rules serves to focus both official and public attention on the vandalism problem, it becomes apparent that officials should attempt to formulate the expected results of any proposed rule or policy. They might then avoid the predicament of the doctor who had to say, "The operation was a success but the patient died." In other words, the proposals for controlling interaction settings must be closely scrutinized for unintended consequences and the effects of such consequences should be closely evaluated. It seems that most people want to obey rules, but these are not always the rules you or I want them to obey; sometimes they are the rules of their peers, friends, or some other reference group. It is up to those to whom our parks and recreation facilities are entrusted to see that the rules conducive to preservation and protection are relevant above all others when the public is at play.

A final note of pessimism is in order, though. Do not forget that while camped near Glacier Point in Yosemite, John Muir, the man perhaps most commonly associated with the conservation and preservation of our natural heritage, once set fire to a large fir tree in the middle of a meadow. His audience, then President of the United States Theodore Roosevelt, the president instrumental in creating more National Park and Forest land than all of the presidents who preceded him shouted, "Bully, there's a candle that took five hundred years to make." Though times change, almost all members of society will on occasion find themselves in a setting in which destruction, or a spectacular display, or leaving one's mark, seems to be the most appropriate activity at that time. The problem then is not merely, "Can we eliminate or at least control vandalism?" but "Can we do so without eliminating the essence of the recreational environment we seek?"

The Message of Vandalism

Arthur W. Magill¹

The common perception of vandalism is of a uniformly wanton, meaningless, and senseless crime. When motives for such behavior are not readily apparent, we are quick to call it motiveless and label it as deviant. Those who are wronged or harmed by vandalous behavior are likely to consider the deviant as sick or defective or the product of his environment (Armstrong and Wilson 1973). But, are persons who commit vandalism really afflicted with a pathology, are they defective people, and how much does their physical environment determine their behavior?

In the musical play "Camelot," knights cry "Fie on goodness! Fie!" and long for war, some killing, and pillage to brighten their lives. Isn't their rebellion closely akin to that of the bored youths of a low-income housing project? Can we see in the knights, those "good citizens" of another time, the counterparts of today's vandals? And can we really say that the acts of either group are without cause--motiveless?

Social psychologist Stanley Cohen (1973) has said that deviance is a social phenomenon. It commences when vandalous acts become visible and create public awareness. Various individuals and groups then draw additional attention to acts they regard as threatening to their own system of moral values. When public concern and support is stimulated through the appeals to commonly held beliefs of causation, such as immorality or emotional disturbance, those responsible for vandalous acts can be labeled as deviants. At this point, a social problem is recognized and control efforts begin. The likelihood exists, however, that the "deviants" may have been condemned on the basis of unfounded beliefs; there may be no attempt to help them by identifying the meaning behind their acts.

But just what is behind vandalism? Physical and mental defects; broken homes; public indifference; and failure of parents, schools, and our social system to teach responsibility and morality have been specified by the Feder-

al Bureau of Investigation as contributing to vandalism (Bennett 1969). Seeing human needs as the basis of the problem, Cohen (1973) suggested the need to get money, to advance a personal objective, to express social protest, to gain revenge for some imagined or real wrong, to gain release for hatred, and, in children, to express curiosity and competition through spontaneous play.

Our willingness to write off vandalism as senseless and wanton and to apprehend and punish vandals should be replaced by the desire to identify motives and modify stimuli. Unfortunately, if we learn that vandalism on wildlands is related to problems of cities--pollution, unemployment, poor housing, and other inequities--we may respond by "externalizing" vandalism--we may see it as outside our area of influence. Greenberg (1974) found, for example, that school administrators chose to externalize vandalism because they believed its source was outside of the school system and not their problem. Resource managers could easily take such a course, but they would then face the need for frequent police action, frequent replacement of facilities, and constant concern in facilities design to inhibit acts of vandalism. Greenberg also found, however, that school efforts to maximize security and harden facilities were doomed to failure. The evidence clearly points to the need to identify motives and remedy problems at their source.

ENCOURAGEMENT TO VANDALISM

Despite some evidence to the contrary (Clark 1971), studies have found the majority of vandalism to be caused by youth, generally between 13 and 21 years of age (Bennett 1969, Armstrong and Wilson 1973). This kind of information tends to make adults regard any gathering of teenagers with suspicion. In addition, some adults regard young people as a kind of "nonpeople" or "not-yet-people," who are bothersome and have no feelings. Under these conditions, the adults might be seen as the true vandals, or more precisely, contributors to vandalism.

Goldmeir (1974) found that parents tend to interfere with the squabbles of their

¹ Principal Resource Analyst, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Berkeley, California.

children or to object to activities, innocent in themselves, which the parents find annoying. Consequently, simple conflicts of interest may grow out of proportion and lead to vandalous acts by the children aimed at "getting back" at those who originally interfered or complained of their behavior. Calling in the police only tends to intensify the problem; a nonthreatening third-party mediator is really needed.

A possibly more serious parent-child problem develops when the child acts out the parents' deviant fantasies (Ward 1973). For example, if parents are unemployed and housing is poor, there may be continual fights between family members, and complaints and even threats may be directed toward the social system. Children listen, observe, and then vandalize facilities that are symbolic of the sources of their parents' problems. Again, arresting and punishing the children does not reach the cause of the problem. The adult behavior and its causes are the problems that need solving.

Let's briefly consider why police action is not generally acceptable. In Scotland (where police may not differ appreciably from our own), researchers (Armstrong and Wilson 1973) found that vandalism and delinquency were developed by police action. The police tended to harass teenagers when they were not causing trouble until the youngsters decided to give them reasons for "busting" them. A library search of newspapers would undoubtedly reveal numerous examples of similar police-youth conflicts.

Planners, developers, architects, and other public officials may also be considered "vandals" as a consequence of poor design, failure to recognize social or cultural needs, or indecision in urban development or redevelopment planning (Ward 1973). Robert Sommer (1972) indicated that good design should go beyond mere physical structure and should consider social consequences. Poorly designed buildings and projects have nearly three times the crime rate of adjacent well-designed projects, even when densities and social characteristics of residents are identical (Newman 1972). It may follow that if good building design results in lower crime, then good facility layout design should reduce vandalism in parks and other recreation areas. Just "hardening" facilities, though it does not stop vandalism, may slow it, however. Similarly, prompt repair or replacement when damage does occur, can reduce repetition (Ward 1973). For example, Anselmo Lewis, retired ranger on the Mt. Baldy District of the Angeles National Forest, discovered that people were digging up trees and shrubs planted to beautify recreation areas. Frustrating as it

was, he replanted each time until the plants were finally established.

Design to serve the social and cultural needs of people is far more important than design to gain the plaudits of one's peers. The first should produce a more livable environment which is less likely to breed vandalism; the second may only serve the designer's ego and perpetuate public ills, including vandalism. In another study, British investigators (Ward 1973) found that residents liked historic old buildings which contributed an appealing character to various districts. Time can be an enemy of such structures if administrators allow them to stand unrepaired or unreplaced, because they soon become targets for vandalism. Vandalous acts may be assured, however, if historic structures are replaced without replicating culturally accepted styles. Neglect and indecision by administrators may be termed bureaucratic vandalism; it may stimulate acts of traditional vandalism by residents (Cruickshank 1973).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONTROL

Various means for controlling vandalism have been suggested, and some of the proposed solutions have actually worked, though usually for specific problems. There does not appear to be any universal remedy, but some approaches seem promising. Increasing the visibility of vandals, developing means for two-way communication, and getting people involved in community programs are among the many techniques that may lead toward more universally successful controls, possibly with decreasing need for punishment.

Increasing Visibility

Oscar Newman (1972) claimed the battle against crime can only be won when people stop trying to protect themselves individually and unite as a community. He approached the problem through design; design that makes the criminal or any intruder cognizant of his visibility and the resident capable of recognizing and repelling intruders. It is design that binds individuals into a defensible community; he calls it "defensible space." The key to his design is improved surveillance. Buildings constructed in new housing projects are arranged to be intervisible. Apartment windows and entry ways are located to make grounds, entries and halls easy to observe. Landscaping is pleasing but does not provide good hiding places. Buildings and external structures, such as fences, are arranged to separate public from semipublic spaces. The entire design works to build a sense of community. It not only makes the area easily observable but encourages neighbor familiarity, thereby assuring that unknown individuals or

undesirable activities are quickly recognized and controlled.

Newman's approach suggests that recreational areas may be designed to establish a "temporary sense of community" among users, allowing them to respond to depreciative behavior effectively yet without jeopardizing anyone's personal safety. The success of such a design requires interaction among recreationists. Several years ago such interaction may not have occurred, but today evidence indicates a new breed of wildland user; one who is socially oriented and therefore establishes new friendships during his vacation (Clark and others 1971). If developed recreation areas are patronized by such visitors, then designing defensible spaces for their use may provide the proper mix of ingredients to increase surveillance and reduce vandalism.

Good design, design that is not only defensible but which effectively serves real human needs, should invite greater use of areas now going unused. Increased use, in itself, may provide a deterrent to vandalism. For example, New York's Central Park has been known for its high occurrence of serious crime. In recent years public use was increased because city authorities offered new and interesting programs and activities. The resultant large crowds provided a greater amount of defensible space--defensible because the greater numbers of users made more park area visible. Criminal elements soon recognized the park was no longer an "unclaimed" space, but a public property on which they were now in jeopardy. Crime in Central Park has decreased² and increasing use is recognized as a successful technique for making parks and other areas safe for public use (Gold 1972, Ward 1973).

Listening and Transmitting

Failure to communicate may be a basic problem for both the victim and the vandal. Stanley Cohen (1973) said, "Vandalism is a solution...ugly and incoherent...difficult to explain...and it will continue to be used until society gets the message." The deviant is transmitting but we are not listening, and we are also transmitting, but because we do not listen, we do not know what messages to send.

What are some of the messages expressed by deviant behavior? Aldo Leopold (1966) defined an ethic in two ways. In ecological terms, he said, an ethic is "a limitation on freedom of action in the struggle for existence," and in philosophical terms it is "a differentiation of social from anti-social conduct." Possibly, the vandal's "unrecognized cause" or "anti-social act" is merely his expression of disrespect for limitations

on his freedom of action imposed by people with a different ethic. His action may have nothing to do with disrespect for the environment, as some believe it does, but it may be a way of "getting at" those who violate the deviant's perceived rights or ethics. Thus, when tables, water systems, barriers, and toilets are destroyed in a campground, resource managers might regard this as a message announcing that somebody feels his rights have been violated. It may be advisable for managers to learn to listen, to identify causes, to examine rules and restrictions, and to change some rules, or to explain why other rules are needed. If the first two of these goals can be achieved, managers may finally "get the message." However, if changing the rules and educating the users are necessary, then managers must also learn how to send their messages effectively.

Effective communication with the public poses a problem for resource agencies. Recently, Ross and Moeller (1974) found that campers on the Allegheny National Forest were not well informed about camping rules. The least informed groups were adolescents, first-time campers, nonlocal users, and tent campers. Messages needed general improvement and required a positive tone. In Colorado, a study of the effectiveness of a wilderness permit information program showed that newspapers and television reached a large number of people, but that few of these people were wilderness users (Fazio and Gilbert 1974). One study conducted by a State agency and two studies by Federal agencies found that despite agency programs to inform campers about where to camp or about campsite reservation systems, most had obtained the information from their friends (Taylor and Knudson 1972, USDI National Park Service 1974, Magill 1976). To reach the public, the messages resource managers send must be more attention-getting, must be clearly written and precisely directed toward well-identified audiences, must avoid irrelevant attempts at regulation, and must recognize real human needs.

Getting People Involved

Vandalism might be regarded both as a symptom of illness in a segment of our society, and an effort by the afflicted segment to cure itself through the expression of hostility, frustration, and helplessness. Psychiatrist Matthew Dumont (1968) proposed this symptomatic approach for examining the ills of cities. Dumont also enumerates people's basic need for a stimulating environment, a feeling of personal pride of self-esteem, a sense of community, and a sense of control over their environment. When basic needs are not supplied in the ghettos, efforts to supply them assume the symptomatic form of riots.

²Personal communication with Charles Lewis, Horticulturist, Morton Arboretum, Lisle, Illinois.

Vandalism may merely be a less violent symptom of the same pathology expressed with less risk of apprehension or injury. Schools may also contribute to the illness, especially if they are meaningless to students who see themselves trapped by training that leads to futureless jobs and no chance to escape poverty (Cohen 1973).

Horticulturist Charles Lewis (1973) described a program that seemed to successfully rekindle stimulation, self-esteem, sense of community, and environmental mastery in residents of a very large housing project, where crime, including vandalism, was high. The New York Housing Authority sponsored a gardening contest designed to encourage tenant participation with minimal guidance. Remarkably, most residents of the project got involved and the results were heartening! Not only were beautiful gardens produced, but streets were cleaned and buildings were painted. The entire neighborhood assumed a new look, and most important, vandalism decreased! The gardens survived because the residents could identify the vandals and gave them the job of guarding the plants!

The same technique proved effective for stopping littering and other undesirable acts by a group of youths at a recreation area in a high-income California community (personal communication with Michael Halloran)³. A few of the suspected teenagers were hired to clean the grounds, and the problem soon disappeared.

The basic human needs of people in cities may also influence the management of recreation areas. Speaking about planning for municipal, state, and national recreation areas, Lieberman (1970) claimed such areas may act as therapeutic environments where city dwellers can receive fresh stimulation and regain some sense of control over their environment. But, the resource manager needs to be aware that some urbanites may bring with them the frustrations spawned in a repressive environment. Their desire to achieve stimulation, self-esteem, and environmental mastery may not tolerate the unexpected and seemingly irrelevant regulations so important to the managers. The unanswered question is, how can resource managers get recreationists involved, thereby preventing depreciative behavior?

Another way to achieve involvement is suggested by resource agency use of public hearings to feel the pulse of concerned citizens on sensitive issues. The same technique may help to identify site and facility designs that most nearly satisfy the users' needs, or to indicate which regulations are irrelevant

and possibly need to be changed or deleted. It is quite unlikely, however, that public hearings will stimulate responses from persons who themselves show depreciative behavior, especially those whose frustrations are the product of some institution other than a resource agency. The observational techniques Robert Sommer (1972) suggested for identifying relevant information for designing buildings may prove useful for designing recreational facilities and regulations. The technique requires the involvement of managers rather than recreationists. The user's opinion is expressed only by his behavior, which is observed and recorded. Thus, use or misuse and compliance or defiance are the criteria for site, facility, and regulation design. Unfortunately, the observational approach doesn't get to the heart of depreciative behavior. As previously mentioned, the source of vandalism is likely to be outside of the forest, but ignoring or externalizing it will not solve the problem. It may be necessary for resource managers to work through State and Federal legislatures to provide city officials with the kind of support essential for correcting the social ills of our society.

A universal solution for stopping vandalism has obviously not been revealed in this discussion, nor does a solution appear to be on the horizon. Considerable research is needed to develop and test the few approaches discussed. Possibly the greatest advantage of meeting to evaluate serious problems may be the opportunity to expose myths and stimulate new ideas. The knights of Camelot who cried "Fie on goodness," appeared to be a wild lot, not unlike the "hooligans" who ravage our cities and recreation areas. Yet, despite our wars and apparently increasing crime rates, perhaps we should take heart from the words of Robert Ardrey (1961)--"The miracle of man is not how far he has sunk but how magnificently he has risen." If we consider the premise that man descended from a killer ape, then possibly our many efforts to achieve peace may signify the hope for achieving victory over crime.

References

- Ardrey, Robert
1961. *African genesis*. 384 p. Dell Publ. Co., New York.
- Armstrong, Gale, and Mary Wilson
1973. Delinquency and some aspects of housing. p. 64-84. *In* *Vandalism*. Colin Ward, editor. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.
- Bennett, Joseph W.
1969. *Vandals wild*. 238 p. Bennett Publ. Co., Portland, Oreg.
- Clark, Roger N.
1971. *Undesirable behavior in forest*

³Personal communication with Michael Halloran, Director of Pupil Services, San Ramon Valley Unified School District, Danville, California.

- campgrounds. p. 150-155. In Recreation Symp. Proc. USDA Forest Serv., North-eastern Forest Exp. Stn., Upper Darby, Pa.
- Clark, R. N., J. C. Hendee, and F. L. Campbell
1971. Values, behavior, and conflict in modern camping culture. *J. Leis. Res.* 3(3):143-159.
- Cohen, Stanley
1973. Property destruction: motives and meanings. p. 23-53. In *Vandalism*. Colin Ward, editor. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.
- Cruickshank, Dan
1973. Developers as vandals. p. 184-214. In *Vandalism*. Colin Ward, editor. Van Nostrand Reinhold, Co., New York.
- Dumont, Matthew P.
1968. The absurd healer: perspectives of a community psychiatrist. 186 p. Science House, New York.
- Fazio, J. R., and D. L. Gilbert
1974. Mandatory wilderness permits: some indicators of success. *J. For.* 72(12): 753-756.
- Gold, Seymour
1972. Nonuse of neighborhood parks. *J. Amer. Inst. Plann.* (Nov.) p. 369-378.
- Goldmeir, Harold
1974. Vandalism: the effects of unmanageable confrontations. *Adolescence* 9(33): 49-56.
- Greenberg, Bernard
1974. School vandalism: its effects and paradoxical solutions. *Crime Prevention Rev.* 1(2):11-18.
- Leopold, Aldo
1966. A sand county almanac. 295 p. Sierra Club/Ballantine Books, New York.
- Lewis, Charles A.
1973. People-plant interaction: a new horticultural perspective. *Amer. Hort.* 52(2):19-24.
- Lieberman, Maury
1970. Parks and urban mental health. *Trends* 7(3):30-32.
- Magill, Arthur W.
1976. Campsite reservation systems--the camper's viewpoint. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Pap. PSW-121, 15 p. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Berkeley, Calif.
- Newman, Oscar
1972. Defensible space: crime prevention through urban design. 264 p. The McMillan Co., New York.
- Ross, Terence L., and George H. Moeller
1974. Communicating rules in recreation areas. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Pap. NE-297, 12 p. Northeastern Forest Exp. Stn., Upper Darby, Pa.
- Sommer, Robert
1972. Design awareness. 142 p. Rinehart Press, Corte Madera, Calif.
- Taylor, Charles E., and Douglas M. Knudson
1972. The camper in Indiana state-operated campgrounds. Purdue Univ., Agric. Exp. Stn. Res. Bull. 888, 11 p.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service
1974. The campsite reservation system--a pilot program in six National Parks. USDI Natl. Park Serv., 104 p.
- Ward, Colin, editor
1973. *Vandalism*. 327 p. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.

A Psychoanalytic View of Vandalism

Robert J. Sokol¹

The subject of vandalism is so broad and includes so many different types and degrees, motivations and methods, that almost every aspect of human and social behavior is encom-

passed. There is no question of the tremendously increasing cost--financial as well as sociological. Historians will trace its antecedents in history. Socialists and psychologists will focus on the societal roots and the sociologic changes that produce and foster the

¹ Physician/Psychoanalyst, Beverly Hills, Ca.

destruction and outpouring of aggression. Their contributions may well lead to an understanding of the broad psychosocial forces and the societal changes that will be necessary for prevention.

I am a different bird--not in anyway better, but different. I am a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst. My concern is with what goes on between the ears of any one individual--what goes on between these ears not only at a level of awareness, that is, consciousness, but at a deeper level as well, outside the level of awareness, that is, the unconscious. What makes an individual destroy and deface in a wanton fashion? We are all aware of the cultural change, the changing social mores, the problems of the disadvantaged, the ghettos, TV violence, drugs, etc. But why does one frustrated school kid pout and another destroy? Why--and how to stop it? A complex problem indeed.

Since, as I mentioned, I wear several hats--as physician, psychiatrist, and a psychoanalyst--I'd like to approach the problem of vandalism as I would any medical problem. I don't intend to convey that this is any better approach than a moral, legal, or sociologic one--but only that it may be different and in its difference, additive to the others.

From my vantage point, vandalism, then, is the symptom, the endpoint of a disruptive behavior. As for any symptom, although the final results are similar, the causative factors may be considerably different. Yellow jaundice may result from liver disease and the backing up of bile products into the blood. The same symptom may result from a blood disease with the breakdown of red blood cells. The causes may be cancer, alcohol, certain types of anemia, or the *Anopheles* mosquito and malaria--but all result in the same symptom. So, the first thing is to attempt a classification of the different psychological determinants which may result in vandalism. If you try to treat the jaundice from alcoholism as you would that from malaria, you're going to have a large number of very dead patients.

I have searched the literature in vain for a classification of vandalism from this point of view, so what follows is an initial attempt:

1. Territorial Imperative--The term derives from observations by Ardrey and others of animal behavior, namely, that all animals attempt to delimit their boundaries--their "turf" in modern vernacular. This might be called the "lifting the leg" or the "Kilroy" syndrome. In its grossest fashion, it can be seen in gang behavior and the various markings on buildings in our cities. In more subtle

forms--the carving on trees, writing in men's rooms, etc.--it may be a way of relieving the tension of being in a strange area and a distorted attempt to maintain psychological continuity in a strange place, perhaps a subtle derivative of the homesickness of youth. The point here is that hostility or aggression may not be a major motivational force.

2. Frustration-Aggression Motivation--In this broad category, a sense of frustration, which is really a combination of helplessness and anger, acquires an aggressive release. It is important that there is a displacement from the original causative object onto a passive recipient object. You get angry at the boss and come home and kick the dog. A child is angry with a teacher (rightly or wrongly) and breaks windows in the school. We see this type of thing normally in children's play--boys smash toy cars together and chortle in glee. When the toy cars become real cars or the house of blocks becomes a school house--then we have troubles. The point is that there is pent-up tension within the person which is relieved by action and destruction. The passive recipient of this behavior, the object--a building or a tree or a car--is not the provocative agent, merely the receptor. Indeed, ask a boy who has broken a window why he did it, and he may well say, "I dunno" or "I didn't think"--unfortunately too often true.

3. Purposeful--political--This is a category of vandalism that unfortunately is on the rise. Witness the bombs, the fires, the "purposeful" destruction for some cause or message. This is not just "letting off steam," but a planned and purposeful act with an ulterior motive.

4. Psychotic Vandalism--This final category is a distinct one that results from what we classically describe as mental illness. Here the violence and vandalism may be random or selective depending on the nature of the illness. The differentiating point is that there is no avowed ulterior motive other than pleasure. The arsonist is one example of a limited psychosis.

These, then, are four categories that I have separated. There may well be others and there is certainly overlapping. But what is the value of this classification--after all shouldn't diagnosis lead to treatment--or at least to avoidance of unnecessary treatment? Here, I think you can direct your treatment attempts to categories 1 and 2. The police will play a major part with category 3, and the mental health professionals with category 4 (once the vandals are apprehended). Of course this statement is an oversimplification; all of us may be involved in different ways with each of these categories.

Before I discuss the "treatment" phase of my medical model, some further diagnostic criteria are necessary. This has to do with the timing and frequency of the vandalism. Is it acute or chronic? Is it a sudden outbreak like an epidemic? Is the rate of increase gradual or rapid? Is the type of vandalism changing? Consideration of each may lead to diagnosis, treatment and, with early diagnosis, prevention becomes more possible. The classic example is a sudden outbreak of vandalism at a school or park--if it is epidemic it always indicates some major dissatisfaction between students and faculty or young people and park administration. Almost always there is some breakdown of communication which may need to be reestablished by a variety of means. In Los Angeles County and elsewhere in the country we have used teams of mental health professionals who have gone into schools as consultants and assisted in the reestablishment (or on some occasions initial establishment) of school-community relations. Could these be useful in parks or other situations?

Now let me put on my other hat, the psychoanalytic one, and get down to some things that go on between the ears, and particularly in the unconscious. I want to emphasize two main points already alluded to--these are (in our terms) object distortion and the phenomenon of transference. I have chosen these two because they are universal; they occur to greater or lesser degree in all of us. The trick to it is, if we are aware of these phenomena then we may be able to anticipate them and take measures to minimize their effects on behavior. I want to emphasize that these are very complex phenomena and this will be only the briefest surface skimming.

In its crudest form, transference means the displacement of feelings or emotions from one person or object to another person or object. In this process the perceptions of current person or object may be distorted in the most subtle or gross fashions. I should mention that this displacement of feelings or emotions, as it occurs in the unconscious, has no relation to real time and indeed often links the past and the present. The most obvious example would be that of a policeman who is the object of fear and hostility even when there is no immediate cause for guilt. He is not being responded to as that individual policeman--who may or may not be a nasty person. You might say he is seen as a representative of a group by whom the person has been threatened in the past. Yet we know that this same type of reaction frequently occurs in those who have had no bad previous experiences with police. In the analyst's office, the unconscious link between the police and the punishing father can often be determined.

Mind you, the link, distortion, or misconnection may have no relation to the real father, but only to that aspect of the father that was involved in punishment.

This seemingly esoteric phenomenon has rather important practical ramifications, for the policeman's actual behavior may foster or diminish these kinds of distortions. For example, it is widely known in police circles that involvement in a family dispute can often result in threats or injury to the policeman who intervenes. When, as in many newer training programs, the officer can be trained to depart from his usual firm or noncommittal expression--for example, to take off his hat, sit down and ask for a glass of water--the outcome can be materially changed. To put it more succinctly, when the officer can come across as a human being, he diminishes the opportunities to project unfavorable characteristics onto him. To translate this into practical terms for park and recreation area managers--what kind of uniforms should park or school police wear and how should they be trained? Some smaller police departments have experimented with replacing the traditional uniform with blazers--with success. In larger city departments it is often felt that this would dilute police authority to a degree that outweighs the advantages. I suspect they are right. Again, the point is that these solutions must be individually tailored for each specific situation. Attempts to employ a single solution "across the board," though it may be a good idea for a given situation, may well lead to getting a bad name and being discarded.

I have attempted to show how these psychoanalytic principles relate to people. But, how do they apply to things? Is it by accident we call our schools "Alma Mater"? Is it by accident that we call our boats "she"? And does this "accident" result in omnipotent distortions that lead boaters, who are untrained or cannot swim, to take their boats into situations for which they are ill prepared; after all, mother is safe and she will protect us from harm. What about a stately tree--what leads a usually nonviolent person to carve his initials, mutilate it, or even hack it down? Is it a tree he is injuring (in his mind), or is it a symbol of beauty or strength that one envies and must destroy or deface to relieve his envy and sensations of inadequacy? In the simplest terms, is it a phallic symbol?--perhaps, but usually much, much more.

Recently, I was in Yosemite sitting on a bench at the base of Yosemite Falls. Ten feet away a young lady sat on a similar bench carefully carving her initials. My friend berated her and received a defensive, angry, and belligerent response before she left--she was

clearly embarrassed. When I walked over, I noted two old sets of carvings next to where she was "lifting her leg." Did the presence of other carvings unconsciously allow or encourage her activities? Would it be cost-effective to have some kind of removal crew?--I don't know.

Again, are these institutions--our parks, our schools--symbolic of extensions of our families? Then, particularly if they are beautiful and the real families are not, will they become the objects of distortion and envy which will necessitate mutilation to "cut them down to size" so to speak? Now the paradox is that if we can actually link our schools and parks (even, dream of dreams, our cities) to the real family, then the controls of the family setting may be extended to these institutions and protect them from distortion and destruction. These are some of the principles that underlie the concepts of developing community involvement in schools and neighborhood parks.

In closing, I want to emphasize that I have only briefly skimmed some of the very complex phenomena involved in vandalism. Let me merely mention one other, that is, that we all need guidelines. It is only with full maturity that the guidelines of behavior become fully internalized. Thus, during our long (and too often perpetual) periods of immaturity, the firmness, consistency, rationality of our external guidelines--our laws--must be maintained. It is important that a system be developed whereby transgressions of the guidelines are rapidly and appropriately punished. Excessive punishment for a particular crime is as useless as an inadequate reprimand and unsupervised probation. After all, the point is to foster growth and internalization of reasonable and appropriate guidelines so that external force and restrictions become less rather than more necessary. But this involves the whole criminal justice system and will require considerably more study.

Vandalism is a problem of and for society, but is done by individuals or small groups of

people. To understand and prevent this problem, it is necessary to understand the forces within the individual. Although broad societal changes are involved, these are dealt with largely through long-term planning and gradual and evolutionary processes. It is my firm conviction that by dealing at an individual or small group level, significant changes and inroads can be accomplished, often in a short time period. I should also mention cost effectiveness. Is it more cost effective to replace all the glass windows in a school with high-tensile-strength plastic? Is it more cost effective to develop and maintain a high-level security force at a school or park? Or is it more cost effective to have available a specifically trained mental health consultant, one who is familiar with the situation, to help develop programs or foster communications to avoid or minimize problems? I think the latter may be very cost effective indeed--ask the Sausalito Police Department and many other groups I could name.

Finally, broad programs may be useful, but they will never replace an individualized problem-solving approach. Psychiatrists and psychoanalysts do not have the answers. What we have is a specific vantage point--on individual and group behavior. This vantage point is one of the many that must be included in the planning process if we are to deal effectively with these problems. The various programs I have alluded to should not be taken as direct suggestions. The final solutions must result from your creative thinking.²

²Useful references include:

Hudson, Bob. 1975. Vandals, should they be hanged? Munic. and Publ. Serv. J. 13 (July).

Pringle, Mia Kellmer. 1973. Property under attack. Munic. and Publ. Serv. J. 13 (July).

Pringle, Mia Kellmer. 1973. Understanding the misfits. Munic. and Publ. Serv. J. 13 (July).

Pringle, Mia Kellmer 1974. The roots of violence and vandalism. *Commun. Health* 6:84.

Ward, Colin. 1971. Vandalism and violence. *Natl. School Publ. Relat. Assoc.*

Ward, Colin, editor 1973. *Vandalism*. 327 p. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.

U.S. Senate Committee Report. 1975. Violence in our schools. *Current* (Nov. issue).

Vandalistic Forest Fire Setting

William S. Folkman¹

VANDALISTIC FOREST FIRES

More than 90 percent of the 100,000 wild-land fires in the United States each year owe their origin to man or some agency of man. What percentage of these fires might be classified as vandalism depends on the definition of this imprecise term. Wildfires are started by a variety of people and their motives are even more mixed. Fire-start behavior ranges from the innocent play of a child to the deliberate, premeditated act of an arsonist; from the unthinking carelessness of a novice camper to the compulsive "acting out" of a pathological personality; from the conditioned reflex action of a smoker discarding a match or cigarette butt to the violent expression of a social protester. Activity more typically recognized as vandalistic--the so-called "wanton," "senseless," or "motiveless" setting of brush or grass fires by groups of youths--is a serious problem in some areas, the rural complement of torching palm trees or tossing incendiary material into parked automobiles. The harassment of fire control organizations by malicious setting of fires is not uncommon. It is not unknown for youthful off-duty firemen to annoy their comrades on another shift by setting a series of nuisance fires.

CULTURAL INFLUENCES

Incendiary forest fires are particularly characteristic of the Southern United States. There incendiarism accounts for almost 40 percent of all forest fires, in contrast to 25 percent nationwide. A cultural perspective is helpful to understanding of the practice of "woods burning" in the Southeastern United States, and also sheds light on careless fire starting in the rest of the country. (Culture is used here in a broad sense, for the behavior

patterns, attitudes, values, and material objects which men employ in coping with their environment--it is the social, as opposed to the biological, inheritance of a people.) The cultural habits of indifference, carelessness, and insensitivity that lead to our notorious littering behavior must surely extend to the careless way in which fire is handled in our forested areas. Hansbrough (1963) finds considerable evidence that early white settlers in the Southern region adopted the long-standing burning practices of Indians of the area--as a hunting aid, to clear the underbrush so as to facilitate visibility and travel, to increase the growth of preferred plants, and to prepare seedbeds. The settlers soon found additional justifications for burning.

Today, "woods-burning" is still a part of the cultural heritage of the South--despite efforts of professional forest managers to discourage the practice. Welch (1970) found that youths in high fire occurrence areas had absorbed parental attitudes supporting a "burning" culture. In some localities, woods-burning has become a retaliatory weapon. In addition to the traditional reasons for burning, setting fires has become a method for expressing antagonism toward governmental agencies and large timber companies--antagonism developed in large measure from past efforts of these organizations to suppress established customs.²

Studies of residents in incendiary "hot spots" (Baird 1965; Bertrand and others 1970; Hansbrough 1961; Jones and others 1965) found the following characteristics noticeable in

¹Senior Social Scientist in Fire Prevention, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Berkeley, California.

²Professional foresters were slow in recognizing the utility of fire as a forest management tool. Carefully prescribed burning for specific management objectives is now generally accepted, but indiscriminate private fire setting is still strongly proscribed.

heads of households: they tend to be older, to have limited education, to be highly localized in their orientation, and to be unemployed or underemployed, retired, or working in unskilled occupations.

Clearly, then, culture strongly determines incendiary behavior in areas of high forest fire risk in the Southern States. The continuing sentiment for burning, along with inadequate understanding of forestry agencies and their work, undoubtedly accounts in large part for the continuing high rates of incendiarism.

In the West, incendiarism contributes to the incidence of forest fires, too, but to a much more limited extent. Generally, starting fires is not supported by the culture, and is considered antisocial, malicious, or pathological. The incendiarism that occurs in the West has a diverse origin, ranging from primarily economic motives to social protest, to classical psychopathology.

Local opinion leaders, sharing many of the same characteristics as the audience to be influenced, have been used successfully in Louisiana and Mississippi in dealing with their incendiary problem.³ Of special importance in this program were the choice of a "contactor", and the manner in which the message was presented. The contactor's success was found to depend on his acceptance by both the local people and the fire prevention agency. He must be a leader, philosopher, and friend to most of the people in the community and one who inspires rapport and trust. Similarly, messages with negative connotations ("Don't burn the woods") are difficult to sell. Messages oriented toward the recognized needs of the local people, including when or how to burn safely (if burning is necessary), or what help is available (in plowing fire lanes, for example) are more successful.

The principle of face-to-face contact by persons who have legitimacy with the group to be influenced appears to be widely applicable. "One of their own kind," with whom problem groups of youths could more readily identify, has been used in some Forests with moderate success.

FIRE PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Most of our research and application efforts have been directed toward defining and reaching the persons we desired to influence.

It is also necessary, however, to know something about the organizations conducting a fire prevention program. In our studies of a State agency (Sarapata and Folkman 1970) and of National Forest organizations (Christiansen and others 1976) we have sought to find out how the organization is set up and staffed; the attitudes, values, and expectations of the employees; and how workers at each level define the fire prevention problem, perceive its importance, and evaluate the effectiveness of the methods and techniques used. All of these affect the type of program that can be mounted and the quality of its execution.

Our studies show that although successful fire prevention work frequently requires considerable experience and training, the program personnel had received little specialized training and were expected to pick up the needed expertise on the job.

A study relating personnel characteristics to fire prevention effectiveness⁴ found that effective and ineffective employees did not differ significantly in such socio-economic or demographic characteristics as age, race, marital status, rural/urban origin, educational level and employment history. They differed significantly, however, in 1) sense of community, 2) conformity, 3) desire for self-improvement, 4) extroversion, 5) importance given to occupation, 6) acceptance of self and other, 7) ability to communicate, and 8) achievement orientation. Although further testing is needed, these measures appear promising for estimating the potential effectiveness of prospective fire prevention employees.

MASS COMMUNICATION

Agencies responsible for forest fire protection depend upon the mass media--primarily radio and television--for much of their prevention effort. Mass communication is a highly complex process, and there are no simple formulae for its use. The reception of the communication is filtered by the recipient's own values, loyalties, identification, expectations, defenses, and frames of reference; by his total personality; and by the particular setting in which the message is received. The message must be transmitted at a time when the recipient can receive it. Unfortunately, public agencies have limited control over the timing of their releases, dependent as they are on the commercial media for donated public service time.

³Doolittle, Max L., and G.D. Welch
1973. Evaluation of a forest fire prevention program. Report on file, USDA Forest Service, Southern Forest Exp. Stn., New Orleans, La.

⁴Mercer, C.W., and M.H. Kootsher
1974. Personnel characteristics and fire prevention effectiveness. Report on file, USDA Southern Forest Exp. Stn., New Orleans, La.

Most fire prevention effort assumes that most of the forest-using public are basically well-meaning and need only to be informed or reminded of desired behavior in order to comply. Such an assumption is hardly warranted in dealing with vandalistic fire setters. Bernardi (1973) has done some experimental work with TV spots specifically designed to appeal to high-risk youth and young adult audiences, the group in which vandalism seems most likely. Considerable success in changing attitudes and knowledge was achieved when the spots were used in a classroom situation, but results were not measurable when the spots were transmitted over commercial television channels.

DELIBERATE FIRE SETTING

The only research we have done to date on incendiary fires in the West was a study of children known to have been involved in one or more fire incidents (Seigelman and Folkman 1971). Multiple firesetting was found to be a symptom of a number of associated problems (such as excessive activity, aggression, psychosomatic illness, and family and school difficulties) rather than the basic problem. In other words, these were troubled children who happened to use fire as a means of striking back at an unrewarding social world or as a cry for help in coping with overwhelming problems. The characteristics of fire make it a particularly effective means for achieving these desired ends. The child himself may not be able to verbalize the motivation for his actions and it may not be apparent to the unsensitized observer. (I use the masculine gender here deliberately--all the children in the study population were males, and over 90 percent of all children identified with any type of fire incident are males.) Our study makes clear that the terms "wanton," "senseless," and "motiveless" are hardly appropriate for the behavior of these children.

For intervention, early identification of potential problem children is essential. Fire investigation personnel cannot be expected to provide therapeutic assistance, but if their investigation reveals that a child shows several of the symptoms in the pattern, community resources should be called in. They can assist the child in resolving his problems before his behavior becomes irreversibly fixed. Fire problem adults are notoriously resistant to therapy.

The children in our study were chosen because they were already associated with fire setting. But most children who cause fires are apparently normal. Fire has a universal fascination, and most children at one time or another engage in some fire play or experimentation. We were interested in how such children learn the appropriate skills, understandings, and attitudes that mediate against the misuse of fire.

The behavior of normal children in relation to fire was studied in a group of 5- and 6-year-olds attending school at the Harold E. Jones Child Study Center of the University of California, Berkeley. The study focus was their competence in potentially hazardous situations (Bloch and others 1976). This study was an outgrowth of a more extended investigation of cognitive competence and social or interpersonal competence. Base data was accumulated from the time they entered the school at age 3.

Wide individual differences in attitudes about fire were found, despite narrow age limits, relative homogeneity, and the small numbers in the sample available for study. No particular theory of childhood fire-setting behavior was expounded in the research, however, its primary value is in hypotheses suggested for further study, and in implications for modifying the prevention programs of fire protection agencies.

The study findings suggest that fire play in very young children is common and should be viewed as curious, exploratory play rather than the psychologically driven, psychopathological behavior that might be seen in fire-setting by older children.

We found similarities in personality characteristics between children with high accident liability and those showing a keen interest in fire. Both the hazards encountered and the ability to cope with hazards were considered. We concluded that methods used in accident prevention may be adaptable to fire prevention efforts.

It is possible that increased control and risk avoidance would be gained at the expense of spontaneity and creativity. Therefore prevention efforts might better be directed toward improving ability to cope with environmental hazards than toward reducing exposure to risks by discouraging otherwise desirable behavior patterns. The goal would be to help the child develop competence in handling potentially dangerous materials (or situations), as he matures.

Another suggestion drawn from this study is that intervention programs must reach the child early in his life. By the age of five, many children are already interested in and experimenting with fire. Parents have had little help in understanding the process by which children learn to recognize and deal with potentially dangerous situations. Consequently, parental efforts vary in effectiveness. Many parents are particularly lax about teaching their children about fire--over one-fourth of those queried make no attempt to do so. It is apparent that parents who are unsure of how to teach their children safety skills would benefit from being

shown alternatives from which they might select a method suitable to the particular needs of their child and compatible with their own needs and capabilities. There are many difficulties in providing such help effectively, however. One suggestion is a training film for parents illustrating various possible teaching strategies.

Other socialization emphases found in this study to be associated with the development of competence in handling fire materials should be considered. Parental child-rearing practices are needed that encourage the child to assume responsibility, to be independent, and to make rational decisions, in the context of clear parental expectations, respect, and caring. Such practices may be expected to promote the development of ego structures in the child that will both benefit growth and minimize play with fire.

CONCLUSIONS

Fire has had a role in certain ecological systems, and highly trained technicians may use fire as a forest management tool. Today, however, an uncontrolled forest fire is almost always a serious threat to important natural-resource values as well as to human life and property. The majority of forest fires are the result of inadvertent, or negligent--not deliberate--acts of man. They are accidents. Interventional actions that are appropriate for accidental fires are probably not the most effective means of dealing with fires of deliberate, vandalistic origin.

As administrators and as researchers, we tend toward a somewhat parochial, pragmatic view of our problems. We are apt to focus, for example, on how we might deal with expected vandalism at Bass Lake on Memorial Day Weekend, rather than on the causes of such social phenomena.

Although I recognize the organizational restraints under which we operate, I have a sense of futility in attempting to resolve a major social problem through localized intervention. I hope that we can escape, to some degree, from the limited perspectives we have forced upon us, or we force upon ourselves.

"Schlock" is a useful term that characterizes much of our material culture today. It describes gadgets and products that are useless, unworkable, shoddily constructed, and sometimes dangerous. It has also been applied to the products of some social scientists and their camp followers who cater to the public's need for quick, easy answers to a seemingly unending succession of threatening social problems--answers that are palatable but slick and superficial (Claiborne 1971). Often some key word

or trend phrase ("future shock," "the naked ape," "the greening of America," "territorial imperative") provides a catchy handle for a simplistic view of uncomfortably complex problems (Martin 1972).

Vandalism, the focus of this symposium, is an imprecise term that covers a variety of types of behavior and motivations. Public repugnance to the highly visible "wanton," "senseless," and "motiveless" destruction of property; public "viewing with alarm," and resultant pressures for action tempt many to accept schlock solutions. My hope is that the members of this symposium will not succumb to the temptation.

LITERATURE CITED

- Baird, Andrew W.
1965. Attitudes and characteristics of forest residents in three Mississippi Counties. Social Center Rep. 8, 48 p. State College, Miss.
- Bernardi, Gene C.
1973. Fire prevention film spots for television...narrator influence on knowledge and attitude change. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Paper PSW-94, 14 p. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Berkeley, Calif.
- Bertrand, Alvin L., William D. Heffernan, G. Dale Welch, and John P. O'Carroll.
1970. Attitudinal patterns prevalent in a forest area with high incendiarism. Bull. 648. 20 p. Louisiana State Univ., Louisiana Agric. Exp. Stn., Baton Rouge.
- Block, Jeanne H., Jack Block, and William S. Folkman
1976. Fire and children: learning survival skills. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Paper PSW-119, 14 p. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Berkeley, Calif.
- Christiansen, John R., William S. Folkman, Keith W. Warner, and Michael L. Woolcott
1976. Organizational factors in fire prevention: roles, obstacles, and recommendations. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Paper 116. 13 p. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Berkeley, Calif.
- Claiborne, Robert
1971. Future schlock. The Nation 212 (6): 117-120.
- Hansbrough, Thomas
1961. A sociological analysis of man-caused forest fires in Louisiana. Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge.

- Hansbrough, Thomas
1963. Southern forests and Southern people.
Louisiana State Univ. Press, Baton Rouge.
- Jones, Arthur, Jr., M. Lee Taylor, and Alvin L. Bertrand
1965. Some human factors in woods burning.
Louisiana State Univ., Louisiana Agric.
Exp. Stn., Baton Rouge. Bull. 601, 27 p.
- Martin, Malachi
1972. The scientist as shaman. Harper's
Mag. 244(3):54-57.
- Sarapata, Adam, and William S. Folkman
1970. Fire prevention in the California
Division of Forestry...personnel and

practices. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Paper
PSW-65, 10 p. Pacific Southwest Forest
and Range Exp. Stn., Berkeley, Calif.

- Siegelman, Ellen Y., and William S. Folkman
1971. Youthful fire-setters...an exploratory study in personality and background.
USDA Forest Serv. Res. Note PSW-230, 6 p.
Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn.
Berkeley, Calif.

- Welch, Gilbert D.
1970. The transference of attitudes of
rural parents to their children. Ph.D.
dissertation, Louisiana State Univ.,
Baton Rouge.

Control of Vandalism in Recreation Areas--Fact, Fiction, or Folklore?

Roger N. Clark¹

Fact: We know it is true.

Fiction: We know it is not true.

Folklore: We believe it is true, but it
may not be.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of the state-of-the-art of knowledge of vandalism in recreation areas and how it can be controlled. Selected literature on this topic is evaluated for practical implications, and procedures for controlling vandalism in recreation areas are described. Research needs are outlined.

This discussion is limited to vandalism in outdoor recreation areas. I have included little material on the more general topic of deviant behavior in recreation areas. Specific types of vandalism and possible variation by geographic areas are not discussed. As an overview, this discussion is not a substitute for a thorough review of the available literature on vandalism and management practices for controlling the problem.

VANDALISM--ITS NATURE AND EXTENT

Other papers in this symposium have des-

cribed vandalism problems, and I won't present a detailed analysis here. But a few examples may help put my discussion in perspective. Needless to say, vandalism is a common problem in many environments in this country as well as in other countries. Vandalism is a major concern for managers of recreation areas and is recognized as a problem by many recreationists as well (Clark and others 1971b).

The monetary impact of vandalism is staggering. The total yearly loss from vandalism nationwide is estimated at \$4 billion (Ward 1973). School vandalism costs over \$200 million per year (Anonymous 1973a, 1973b). The U.S. Forest Service reports vandalism in the National Forests cost the U.S. taxpayers over \$3 million in 1974.² They also report vandalism costs are up 50 percent since 1969. On the Los Padres National Forest alone, costs related to vandalism were more than \$170,000 in 1976. Other agencies report equally large losses from vandalism in their recreation areas.

Discussions with several managers in the Forest Service indicate that the costs reported may be underestimated. They feel that reported losses are mainly due to type of damage that are easily observed and for which a dollar value can be determined. Minor impacts (often hard to distinguish from normal wear and tear) are

¹Principal Research Social Scientist, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Portland, Oregon.

²Figures compiled in the Recreation Information Management System (RIM), USDA Forest Service RIM Center, Washington, D.C.

generally not recorded even though in total they represent a substantial cost to repair or replace.

The analysis of vandalism impacts from only an economic perspective underestimates the total loss. Perhaps even more serious than the financial loss in many places is the impact on the quality of the recreation environment, which has direct bearing on recreationists' experiences.

Some targets for the vandal cannot be assigned a dollar value. Defacement of natural features, such as trees, shrubs, and rocks, represents a serious loss in environmental quality. Even more troublesome is vandalism of irreplaceable resources such as cultural or historical artifacts, whether they are petroglyphs in southern California or the famous Tlingit totems in southeast Alaska. We all lose when these are destroyed, but the loss cannot be measured in an economic sense.

Recreationists lose in other ways when vandalism occurs. Their recreation experience may be affected by the physical and visual destruction. What is not so obvious is the impact on the recreation management program of the agency concerned (Harrison 1976).³ For example, although the dollar loss from vandalism may be insignificant compared with the total investment in recreation areas and facilities, vandalism and littering costs on National Forests in 1974 represented over 15 percent of the total Forest Service recreation management and construction budget.⁴ The costs resulting from vandalism may directly affect users when scarce budgets for recreation must be used to replace or repair facilities rather than to build new ones or hire additional rangers for public service. For example, the \$1.5 million spent on littering and vandalism in California forests in 1974 represents the equivalent of building about 750 new camping or picnic sites.⁵ No wonder recreation

³See also John Zeisel, 1974. Planning facilities to discourage vandalism. American Association of School Administrators, 106th Annual Convention, Feb. 22-24.

⁴Reported in William T. Schlick. 1975. Cy 1974, vandalism and littering on the National Forest System. Unpublished report, USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

⁵Reported in the U.S. Forest Service Daily News Digest, August 15, 1975. This estimate is based on the assumption that new sites cost \$2,000 each. For some types of sites the costs may be nearer \$4,000 per site.

managers cringe at every initial carved in a bench, written on a restroom wall, or spray painted on a rock bluff.

THE LITERATURE ON VANDALISM

For all the money spent on repairing or replacing vandalized facilities or natural features of the environment, little written information exists about vandalism. Our knowledge of why vandalism occurs or how it can be controlled is very limited. I have reviewed much of what is available, and these comments are focused primarily on the usefulness of the literature from a practical perspective; that is, does it help us understand and therefore control the problem?

The literature on vandalism can be divided into two general categories, that which is supported by data (research) and that which is not. The usefulness of each type is briefly described here.

Literature Not Based on Data

Rhetoric or opinion--Much of what has been written about vandalism is no more than rhetoric or opinion.⁶ Such popular articles, books, and even editorials seem to have a large market and are filled with outrage, indignation, and diversity of untested opinions about why vandalism happens and what should be done to control the problem. Any "evaluation" of what works is often subjective, and most of the popular writing focuses on selling the author's pet theories. Rhetorical discussions generally concentrate on spectacular acts and often ignore equally important smaller vandalism problems. Beyond calling our attention to the problem (a worthy objective), such material has little to offer the manager and may even be misleading and dangerous if the many unsubstantiated suggestions are taken seriously.

Theoretical discussions--Another class of literature, although not supported by data, approaches vandalism from a more logical, theoretical perspective. Only a few attempts have been made to verify theories with data (Bates and McJunkins 1962, Bates 1962; Goldman (1961). The writings that fall under this general heading are commonly found in textbooks or academic journals. Usually the author describes or develops a particular theoretical line of reasoning for explaining why vandalism occurs (for

⁶For examples of literature containing primarily rhetoric or opinion, see Anonymous (1967), Bennett (1969), Cardinell (1974), Donahue (1968), Mannheim (1954), Neill (1974), Robarge (1965), Von Kronenberger (1976).

example, aggression, frustration, hostility) and/or how it can be solved (Bower 1954, Clinard and Wade 1958, Cohen 1971, Lippman 1954). Although most papers of this type are devoted to a single perspective, a few have attempted to analyze competing explanations (Jeffery 1971, Ward 1973). Most of the solutions for controlling vandalism proposed in theoretical discussions are logical extensions of the author's particular theoretical perspective. As such, they are only as good as the theory, and most must be judged as unreliable on those grounds alone; that is, they have not been tested. Some suggested solutions are described later.

Research-based Literature

Discussions falling into this category imply that reliable data support the conclusions drawn by the author. Objectivity is a key concept, although theoretical perspectives usually play an essential role in designing the research and/or interpreting the findings from a study. There are two general types of research-based articles, descriptive and evaluative.

Descriptive research--Descriptive studies are the most common type of research on vandalism. Questions about the nature of the vandalism problem, who is involved, when and where vandalism occurs, and how much exists have been addressed in several studies⁷ (Campbell and others 1968, Clark and others 1971a, 1971b; Cardenuto and McCrea [n.d.]; Cardinell 1969; David 1971; Fandt 1961; Mannheim 1954; Martin 1959; Matthews 1970; Perk and Aldrich 1972). This type of information is a starting point and essential to establishing a baseline for time-series studies if the work is well done. Unfortunately, most of this type of research has been based on reported rather than observed behavior, and what is reported is often unreliable. Only a few studies report direct observation of the problem (for example, Clark and others 1971a). Most ignore the many smaller acts of vandalism. Descriptive research is an essential first stage in understanding and thereby controlling vandalism; but in the absence of further evaluative research, it really doesn't directly help control the problem.

Evaluative research--This type of research involves explicit evaluation of the effectiveness of specific programs or strategies for controlling vandalism. The experimental demonstration of cause and effect allows the manager and researcher to establish what really works and

what doesn't. As such, this research provides the single most important type of information from the manager's perspective because he is trying to control the problem. But this type of study is virtually nonexistent for vandalism. Only one source could be found where an objective evaluation had been conducted; in this case, the author demonstrated the effectiveness of a community education program (Palmer 1975). Often the "evaluation" of what works and what does not is based on subjective criteria; that is, it "reportedly" worked somewhere (Irwin 1975, Knudsen 1967b, Martin 1959, Wilson 1964). Consequently, what really works and what doesn't--when, where, and why--is impossible to say. We just don't know. More evaluative studies by managers as well as researchers are necessary to provide important answers that can help reduce vandalism in a variety of settings.

Guidelines for Using the Literature

The watchword in using the literature on vandalism is "caution." If the content of articles or books could be easily classified into the categories I've described, then evaluating their worth from a practical perspective might be relatively easy. But many papers contain elements of all types, making it difficult to separate fact from fiction from folklore.

The buyer must truly be cautious when it comes to finding a solution for vandalism in the literature. Even when a solution seems to work in one case, it won't necessarily work everywhere. Variation from situation to situation requires some evaluation to test the effectiveness of proposed control procedures.

A useful approach for using literature is to identify all the unsubstantiated claims made by the author. Much of what is written is not supported by fact, and a great deal is not even supported by rational arguments.

Even papers with "data" must be viewed with caution. The work may be misleading if the problem under study is couched in different terms from yours, or it may be based on poorly conceived research. Interpret the data yourself to see if you agree with the author. Would you invest your money in a program to stop vandalism based on what you've read and the solutions proposed? If not, keep looking!

ISSUES RELATED TO VANDALISM

Two issues commonly discussed in the literature have important practical implications for understanding vandalism and thereby reducing its impacts: What vandalism is and what causes it.

⁷Paul Petty

1966. Vandalism. Taken from his thesis, "Vandalism in Natural Forests and Parks." Colorado State University.

Definitions of vandalism--a great deal of confusion exists concerning what vandalism really is (Clark and others 1971b, Cohen 1968, Eliot 1954, Harrison 1976, Smith 1966, Ward 1973, and Wilson 1964).⁸ Although there is little difference of opinion about the major acts of destruction, considerable differences do seem to exist concerning some actions in recreation settings.

What is "proper" behavior is not clearly defined; many times an act of vandalism as defined by a manager may be very appropriate from a user perspective. In some cases, recreationists who have little contact with the environment may really not know what is defined as vandalism by managers. In other cases they may know but disagree. Examples include throwing axes into trees, carving on tables and benches, chopping down trees in campgrounds for firewood or for more space. Even though rules exist which prohibit such activities, the fact that users don't understand or agree with them may result in vandalism by definition only. Considerable research has documented this difference in perspective between recreation managers and users (Clark and others 1971b; Hendee and Campbell 1969). Understanding the basis for this difference is essential for any approach to controlling the problem. For this discussion, vandalism is the result of any act (intentional or unintentional) which damages either natural or manmade features of the environment.

Motives for and causes of vandalism--Understanding the motives for and causes of vandalism is an important part of controlling the problem, and many authors have dealt with these topics (Clark and others 1971b, Harrison 1976, Hendee and Campbell 1969, Eliot 1954, Jeffery 1971, Murphy 1954, Perk and Aldrich 1972, Scott 1954, Schaffer 1975, and Ward 1973).⁹ But there is no proven theory of the causes of vandalism. Many theories or perspectives attempt to explain the problem from biological, psychological, or sociological perspectives. No one that I know of has tried to integrate these approaches, and most authors ignore the extremely important effects that the environment and specific situations play in explaining vandalism (Jeffery 1971). One perspective inherent in many of the discussions of motives or causes warrants comment here. Although many people fail to recognize any rationale behind vandalistic acts (they are often thought of as strictly a wanton, malicious activity), several writers have argued that this is not so (Campbell and others 1968, Clark and others 1971b, Cohen

1968b, Eliot 1954, and Ward 1973).¹⁰ Usually a reason can be found for vandalism; for example, play, lack of alternatives, vindictiveness (Cohen 1968c, Madison 1970, Ward 1973). And, although vandalism with a reason behind it is still inappropriate, understanding the underlying motives and causes is important in its eventual control.

SOLUTIONS¹¹ FOR CONTROLLING VANDALISM

Education

A common approach proposed for control of vandalism is to educate the public (recreation users in this case) about vandalism; that is, make them aware of why it is bad and the need for their help in solving the problem. Traditional educational programs have focused on instilling proper values and attitudes regarding vandalism. The basic assumption is that proper behavior will then result; people won't vandalize or let vandalism occur. Much evidence, however, suggests that attitudes about an issue or problem may be different from one's behavior. For example, attitudes regarding littering have been shown to be very different from actual littering behavior--we may believe it's bad but litter anyway (Clark and others 1972, Heberlein 1971).

In review of the sociology literature on research concerning attitudes and behavior, Wickler (1969) concluded that only about 10 percent of the variation in actual behavior could be explained by knowledge of attitudes! The basic reason for the discrepancy is that many factors are related to actual behavior in addition to attitudes, especially features that vary from one situation to another and make different behaviors attractive or available. The social group one is with, for example, can either increase or decrease the likelihood of acts leading to vandalism. Therefore, in terms of the problem facing managers of recreation areas, this educational approach has limited potential for solving the vandalism problem since we're primarily concerned about behavior. If Wicker's conclusions are valid as applied to vandalism, traditional education (focusing on attitudes and values) would result in no more than a 10 percent reduction in vandalistic behavior, even if the targets

¹⁰See footnote 3

¹¹Solutions to vandalism are discussed by Anonymous (1967, 1973a, 1973b, 1973c), Bennett (1969), Cardenuto and McCrea (n.d.), Irwin (1975), Kelly (1973), Knudsen (1967a, 1967b), Martin (1959), Matthews (1970), Neill (1975), Petty (1966), Ward (1973), Weinmayer (1973), and Wilson (1964). (Also see footnote 3).

⁸See footnote 3.

⁹See footnote 3.

for the educational programs are potential vandals and the intended attitudes and values are generated by the program. Cohen (1968a) even thinks that publicity about a problem may backfire; it may even elicit problem behaviors. For example, publicizing a campaign to remove graffiti from rock walls in a recreation area identifies a target for future vandalism: "Wouldn't it be fun to spray paint the same wall the day after the cleaning crew leaves!"

Regardless of the approach used in educational programs, some general rules of thumb may make them more effective:

1. An effective educational program will require that the manager understand user motives and desires. Considerable evidence suggests that managers and users often disagree on what is appropriate, including things which are labeled as vandalism by managers (Clark and others 1971b, Hendee and Campbell (1969). Managers are often misled when they interpret user motives and desires by their own value systems. Identifying areas of disagreement (and reasons for them) is an important starting point for understanding the problem and developing effective educational programs.

2. Users must also understand the manager's motives. Managers often forget that they may be part of the problem. Both individual and organizational attitudes (and behaviors) are important and may have an impact on users' perceptions and behavior. Attitudes about recreation in general (is it legitimate or not?) and toward specific users (motorcyclists, hikers, etc.) affect our behavior in ways that may either reduce or increase problems. Do you favor "hard or soft sell approaches"; that is, educate or arrest? Do you ignore minor acts of vandalism (or other problems)? If so, you may be condoning the problem in the user's mind.

Division of responsibilities on a functional basis within an agency can result in a disastrous situation if, for example, patrolmen responsible only for fire prevention ignore other recreation-related problems in their areas. The public may be misled by agency behavior if inappropriate acts are ignored in one case but acted upon in another. Different management policies between agencies further confuse and frustrate users.

Many well-intentioned attempts by managers to help solve important problems may result in vandalism. This often happens when management actions conflict with user goals. For example, roads are often closed for lack of maintenance budgets, concern over erosion, fire hazard, etc. Gates or signs which are an attempt to implement the manager's decisions are torn down, shot up

or driven around, often damaging natural environmental features. Why? Perhaps in some cases this vandalism occurs not for its own sake but to allow the "vandal" to achieve some other goal--getting to a favorite lake or campsite, for example. Public campgrounds are often closed entirely or in part during the "off-season" to save scarce recreation management dollars, a worthy objective. But vandalism (or at a minimum, extreme frustration) can occur for some users when they feel confined and crowded without apparent reason in certain areas not to their liking or when a favorite, more isolated site may be just beyond a gate or sign over a barrier post or pile of dirt. Who is guilty? Certainly we cannot excuse the vandalism, but understanding why it happens may help us identify conditions where management actions can lead to vandalism.

We need to continue to ask why we are doing what we do and will it make sense and be agreeable to users. Conflicting goals and values must be identified and effective two-way communication and education initiated to minimize the impacts from such disagreement.

3. Attempts to control vandalism or other problems with messages lacking rationale are often doomed to fail. If people don't understand the "why" behind the do's and don't's conveyed in signs, vandalism can result.

Why can't cars be driven off parking pads?

Why can't tables be moved (even when chained down)?

Why can't more than one family camp at each campsite?

Why can't a tree be chopped down for firewood or to get a pickup camper into a site?

Why can't initials be carved on benches or tables or trees?

Signs (or other communication mediums) should convey the reason for the regulation whenever possible. Such "positive signing" would, I think, help eliminate some vandalism in many areas. Certainly, effective enforcement procedures will still be necessary for people who ignore the most rational rules.

Direct Management

A variety of ways exist for directly managing areas, facilities, or natural environmental features to reduce or prevent vandalism. Some of these approaches have been covered in other symposium papers, and I will only briefly review them here.

Design of sites or facilities--Considerable effort has been expended to design vandalism-proof sites. Much has been written about this

topic (Anonymous 1973c, Miller 1973, Spalding 1971, Weinmayer 1973). Although there have been many successes (Weinmayer believes proper design can reduce vandalism by 90 percent), my impression is that we often fail in this approach. Many times it seems that when a particular type of vandalistic act is prevented through design, another unanticipated problem results. For example, in a campground I recently visited, restroom walls in the area were made of material harder than knife blades to prevent vandalism. Indeed, carving and scratching with knives was eliminated. But the problem was not solved because the native rock in the area was harder than the construction material, and carving and scratching with rock resulted. Although design may be an important element in preventing some vandalism, little evidence exists for a foolproof solution through design. New ideas emerge daily, but many have not been evaluated for their effectiveness in different locations.

Maintenance--Replacing or repairing the evidence of vandalism as quickly as it occurs is proposed as another strategy for solving the problem. The assumption is that by keeping the area nice it will stay that way. A great deal of folklore exists about the effectiveness of this procedure, but little has been verified. To the extent that the problem continues (which it often does) maintenance is not a complete solution. We often have to "re-repair" (Cardenuto and McCrea n.d.). Perhaps vandalism may be reduced to some extent by maintenance, but the evidence available does not allow a clearcut answer for every case.

Fees--Some managers believe vandalism and other problems such as littering are reduced when fees are charged. The belief is that users tend to have more at stake and greater feelings of ownership in an area where they pay to stay. An alternative view is that when fees are charged, users may feel they have more right to "tear it up." There is no reliable information to support or refute either viewpoint. U.S. Forest Service figures indicate that costs for vandalism and littering in the National Forests were greater per user in areas where fees were charged.¹² However, reasons other than the fee itself may explain this difference: Some Forest Service managers feel that these data underestimate the true cost from vandalism, perhaps more in one type of area than another; more people generally use fee areas; fee areas generally have more facilities to be vandalized; and the introduction of fees may affect the type of clientele an area receives. Other unidentified factors may also be involved.

¹²See footnote 2.

Removal of opportunity--Eliminating the opportunity for vandalism by removing facilities, closing areas, or hiding what can be vandalized has been proposed as a solution and is done in some places. We can take away or not provide wooden posts, tables, restrooms, signs, etc. We can close access to large areas such as commercial or public forests, and we can close entry to specific areas by barricading roads (subject to problems discussed earlier). Or we can hide valuable objects such as cultural or historical artifacts. In general, this approach will work. Indeed, it's about the most predictable solution available. However, in doing so, we must consider the negative impacts on other users who are not responsible for the problem. If this prescription were followed in areas with major vandalism problems, in most cases, the majority of well-intentioned users would suffer because of a relatively few people. In the case of irreplaceable objects such as historical artifacts, perhaps we have no solution but to remove or hide them until such time as they can be protected. For other things which can be replaced, the relative advantage gained from this remedy is not so easily ascertained.

Detection and Enforcement

Increased detection and strict enforcement of laws, policies, and rules are often proposed as a way to deter vandalism (Anonymous 1973a, Thomas 1964). To be most effective as a deterrent, this approach must result in punishment; the potential vandal must realize he will probably be seen, caught, and punished (Jeffery 1971). Unfortunately, this is often not the case for most crimes against the environment in this country (Jeffery 1971) and certainly not in most recreation areas (Clark and others 1971a, 1971b). This is not to say, however, that enforcement programs are worthless, only that they are a small part of the solution. Possible ways to increase the effectiveness of detection and enforcement programs in recreation areas include increasing the number of patrols, adjusting patrolmen's hours (or those of cooperating law enforcement agencies) to match recreation use and problem times, hiring watchmen (Matthews 1970), and establishing entrance stations where each party is contacted and, perhaps, registered in particularly bad areas.

Public Involvement

Involving the recreating public in helping to solve vandalism is a new approach which has been recently proposed and used in some areas. A few authors have dealt with this approach (Anonymous 1967, 1973b; Clark and others 1971a, 1971b; Neill 1975; Ward 1973; Wilson 1964). The focus is to find ways to change users' behavior to reduce their own vandalistic acts as well as those of other people.

Research on depreciative behavior, including vandalism in outdoor recreation settings, indicates that this approach has tremendous potential for reducing the problem. In one study nearly 80 percent of all depreciative acts occurred in the presence of other people, yet no one got involved (Clark and others, 1971a, 1971b; Campbell and others, 1968). Why? Possible explanations for the noninvolvement include apathy, fear or threat from getting involved, lack of agreement on the definition of what is proper, and lack of knowledge about how one can get involved. The point here is that we can't assume people won't help. There may be things we can do to encourage their involvement without threat to them.

A variety of ways can involve people, depending on the objective. Some basic assumptions and approaches are briefly described here.

Involve the victim--On public recreation lands, the victim of vandalism and other types of depreciative behavior is the public. Since the research described above indicates that often people are present when these acts occur, what can they do to help? How can managers increase user involvement? Alternatives range from encouraging users to handle problems themselves (and showing them how) to contacting proper authorities and giving them essential information. Others advocate paying people for information about vandals they observe. Perhaps some sort of "help the ranger" campaign might encourage people to help reduce vandalism. Part of the solution certainly will be to develop procedures whereby the public can get involved with little personal threat.

Involve the culprit--The objective here is to provide a constructive alternative to destructive behavior. This approach has been used for both adults and children in a variety of areas. It seems to work because it gives people involved a stake in the problem. For example, in response to vandalism of recreation cabins during the winter season by snowmobilers, the suspected culprits were organized and asked to help protect the homes; they did and vandalism ceased. Two boys in a developed campground who were suspected of vandalizing restrooms and nature trail signs were involved in a litter pickup program to help the campground ranger; vandalism ceased¹²

¹²Roger N. Clark. How to control litter in recreation areas: The incentive system. In preparation for publication, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Portland, Oreg.

(Clark and others, 1972). And in a forested area in Spain, youths suspected of vandalizing birdcages for protecting certain species were involved in constructing new cages; vandalism ceased.¹³ Other similar management approaches seem possible.

Involve people in formal programs--The two approaches described above focus on involving people informally. In some cases, programs for specific individuals assuming some formal responsibilities may be useful. Individuals or couples may be selected and trained to perform some of the duties of agency personnel. Their presence in problem areas can increase the manager's visibility and allow one-to-one contacts with users.

In the West, a "campground host" program has been implemented in several areas. The volunteer hosts, usually retired married couples, live on campgrounds, and their presence is reported to have decreased vandalism problems. The public has enthusiastically supported this effort, and many people have volunteered their services. Other problems have also been reduced. For example, in one U.S. Forest Service location where the host program was in effect, local managers indicated that as vandalism and other depreciative behaviors decreased, voluntary compliance in turning in overnight camping fees increased. Other formally established programs such as the "Older American" program have been used in other locations for similar purposes.

Although campground hosts usually have no formal enforcement authority, they have been successfully used when problems in selecting appropriate people are overcome. In Australia, formal authority has been given to a ranger force made up of citizens, and some successes are reported.¹⁴

A public involvement program should be focused at a variety of levels. It can include year-round involvement through organized groups as well as routine, ongoing efforts during the main recreation season such as the campground host program. The public that moves through the area and stays for short periods only should be involved. So should both culprits and victims. Identifying and evaluating ways to accomplish public involvement at all of these levels are important concerns for both managers and researchers.

¹³Personal communication with Antonio Nadal Amat, Head of the Department of Environmental Analysis, Madrid, Spain.

¹⁴Personal communication with Allan Viney, member for Wakehurst, Legislative Assembly of New South Wales. Sydney, N.S.W.

A final approach to vandalism is to treat it like shoplifting: We do all we can to stop it, including proper design, maintenance, and replacement; but we assume some will occur and charge the consumers (users) the resulting cost. In this view, vandalism is accepted as a fact, one of the impacts from recreation use.

Available statistics indicate a relatively small cost per visitor for vandalism in outdoor recreation areas. On the National Forests, the average cost for vandalism and littering was approximately \$0.03 to \$0.10 per visitor day during 1974.¹⁶

Although many legal and political problems exist, establishing a user surcharge for vandalism would insure that other options are not foregone if the scarce recreation management budgets are used in repairing or replacing damaged facilities. Such a surcharge would make users clearly aware of the financial impact of vandalism.

SUMMARY OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR CONTROLLING VANDALISM

A variety of procedures for controlling vandalism have been proposed and readers are encouraged to make their own judgment about the relative advantages and disadvantages of each. My conclusion is that none of the alternatives I've described offers a complete solution to vandalism, problems are still increasing, and the level of uncertainty for complete success in using any of the approaches is high. We don't know at this time what works best, when, where, how, or why. A great deal of folklore exists about the "best approach," and many of the alternatives may be costly and risky. But any long-range solution will require a variety of approaches.

Prevention programs should focus on the various social, political, and physical-environmental factors to reduce vandalistic behavior and increase antivandalistic behavior. We know little about how all the possible controlling factors interact, and research is necessary to identify the important factors and evaluate their relative advantages and disadvantages in a variety of conditions.

Some vandalism problems may be controllable, others may not. In the absence of severe restrictions on use and users, we may have to accept some forms of vandalism because the controls may be worse than the problems they are meant to solve.

Several authors have recognized the need for more research on vandalism (MacNeil 1954, Palmer 1975), particularly the need for evaluation (David 1971). To be maximally useful, research on vandalism and other forms of depreciative behavior would be based on close communication and cooperation with managers. Researchers and managers both learn in on-going consultation. Researchers must maintain contact with on-the-ground managers in a variety of areas to insure an appreciation of real-world problems.

An effective research effort to provide useful information for understanding and controlling vandalism should be based on a broad level involving several regions of the country and various agencies and private land managers. This will allow for analysis of both common and unique problems. But we also need to focus on specific situations to control specific problems. Although different kinds of vandalistic acts and recreation areas are similar, much variation exists that may affect the usefulness of "proven" solutions in one area when applied in another.

An important need is establishment and implementation of procedures for objectively identifying and measuring the impacts (physical, as well as those on the users' experience) from vandalism and other depreciative behaviors. Good descriptive baseline data are essential for evaluating the effectiveness of procedures to control the problem.

Another need is development of an understanding of the dynamics of specific locations (and sites) and the needs and behaviors of specific user groups as related to vandalism and other problems. We must design, test, and evaluate programs to fit the needs of specific areas and users of those areas.

CONCLUSION: A CHANGE IN ORIENTATION IS NEEDED

In the absence of any definitive solutions, what can planners and managers do to minimize the vandalism problem? Although no one has the entire answer to this question, I want to offer my perspective on several important points.

The vandalism problem should not be considered separately from other depreciative behaviors such as nuisance behavior, rule violation, and littering. The causes for and solutions to these other problems may hold important clues for reducing vandalism. The campground host program, for example, demonstrates the impact one procedure may have on a variety of problems including vandalism. Past research

¹⁶See footnote 2.

on litter control indicates that by involving the public in control of litter, vandalism and other problems may decline.

We need to develop a program that integrates a variety of approaches (Jeffery 1971, Harrison 1976, Weiss 1974). There is no single best answer now and there probably never will be a blanket solution without considering others (Wilson 1964). All the procedures described in this and other papers in this symposium should be objectively evaluated for their usefulness.

And a variety of perspectives must be considered to understand and control vandalism. This includes the social scientist's (psychologist, sociologist, etc.), the designer's, the manager's, the planner's, and, most important, the user's perspectives.

Above all, it is important when faced with a problem as tough as vandalism to keep a positive attitude. There are no magic answers (Harrison 1976). The problem isn't going to go away, and the danger is that the manager will become so frustrated with day-to-day problems that he will deal ineffectively with recreationists who may not recognize the magnitude of the problem. Recreation is legitimate and worthwhile, but it has impacts and costs like all other resource uses.

Literature Cited

Anonymous

1967. Wreckreation: what can teenagers do about vandalism? Senior Scholastic, May 12, p. 21-23.

Anonymous

1973a. Four alternatives for school security--a counterattack on vandalism. Am. School and Univ. 45(10):43-44.

Anonymous

1973b. Vandalism--\$1 per ADA = kids' incentives. Nation's Schools 92(6):31-37.

Anonymous

1973c. Vandalism: take tempting targets out of washrooms. Nation's Schools 92(2):44-45.

Bates, William

1962. Caste, class and vandalism. Soc. Prob. 9(4):349-353.

Bates, William, and Thomas McJunkins

1962. Vandalism and status differences. Pac. Sociol. Rev., Fall, p. 89-92.

Bennett, Joseph W.

1969. Vandals wild. 238 p. Bennett Publishing Co., Portland, Oreg.

Bower, Eli M.

1954. Vandalism: an outgrowth of hostility, aggression and frustration. Fed. Probation 18(1):12-14.

Campbell, Frederick L., John C. Hendee, and Roger N. Clark

1968. Law and order in public parks. Parks and Recreation 3(12):28-31, 51-55. illus.

Cardenuto, Joseph R., and Edward J. McCrea

[n.d.] Vandalism on private campgrounds. Dep. Agric. Econ. and Rural Sociol., Penn. State Univ. Rec. 2, Res. Ser. 202.

Cardinell, Charles

1969. Relationship of interaction of selected personality characteristics of school principal and custodian with sociological variables to school vandalism. Diss. Abstr. Int. 30(11-A):4710-4711.

Cardinell, Charles

1974. Another view: let's get at the causes of youthful vandalism. Amer. School Board J. 161(1):68-69.

Clark, Roger N., John C. Hendee, and Robert L. Burgess

1972. The experimental control of littering. J. Environ. Educ. 4(2):22-28.

Clark, Roger N., John C. Hendee, and Frederick L. Campbell

1971a. Depreciative behavior in forest campgrounds: an exploratory study. USDA Forest Serv. Res. Note PNW-161, 12 p. Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Portland, Oreg.

Clark, Roger N., John C. Hendee, and Frederick L. Campbell

1971b. Values, behavior, and conflict in modern camping culture. J. Leisure Res. 3(3):143-159.

Clinard, Marshall, and Andrew Wade

1958. Toward the delineation of vandalism as a sub-type in juvenile delinquency. J. Crim. Law, Criminol. and Police Sci. 48(5):493-499.

Cohen, Stanley

1968a. Can it be controlled. New Soc. 12(324):377-378.

Cohen, Stanley

1968b. The nature of vandalism. New Soc. 12(324):375-376.

- Cohen, Stanley
1968c. Politics of vandalism. *Nation* 207 (Nov. 11):497-500.
- Cohen, Stanley
1971. Directions for research on adolescent group violence and vandalism. *Brit. J. Criminol.* 11(4):319-340.
- David, James Edgar
1971. A survey of major incidents of vandalism, causes and preventative measures employed in Texas public junior high schools. *Diss. Abstr. Int.* 32(09-A):4866.
- Donahue, Ron
1968. How to handle vandalism. *Camping Mag.* 40(May):24-25.
- Eliot, Martha M.
1954. What is vandalism? *Fed. Probation* 18(1):3-5.
- Fandt, Edward L.
1961. A study of the practices of New Jersey boards of education in protecting school property against losses due to vandalism and malicious mischief. *Diss. Abstr. Int.* 22(9):3055.
- Goldman, Nathan
1961. A socio-psychological study of school vandalism. *Crime and Delinquency* 8(1):221-230.
- Harrison, Anne
1976. Problems: vandalism and depreciative behavior. *In* *Interpreting the Environment*, ch. 24. Grant W. Sharpe, editor John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Heberlein, Thomas A.
1971. Moral norms, threatened sanctions, and littering behavior. 253 p. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Hendee, John C., and Frederick L. Campbell
1969. Social aspects of outdoor recreation--the developed campground. *Trends in Parks and Recreation*, October, 4 p., illus.
- Irwin, Frank Gordon
1975. A study of features for lessening vandalism for consideration in the planning of educational facilities. *Diss. Abstr. Int.* 36(7-A):4163-A.
- Jeffery, C. Ray
1971. Crime prevention through environmental design. 290 p. Sage Publ., Beverly Hills, Calif.
- Kelly, Ralph L.
1973. Vandalism safety and security. *School Bus. Aff.* 39(7):164-166.
- Knudsen, George
1967a. Summary of 1967 AIN meeting workshops on vandalism. *In* *Papers by George J. Knudsen, Paper III, Assoc. Interpretive Naturalists.*
- Knudsen, George
1967b. Techniques to reduce vandalism on nature trails. *In* *Papers by George J. Knudsen, Paper II, Assoc. Interpretive Naturalists.*
- Lippman, Hyman S.
1954. Vandalism as an outlet for aggression. *Fed. Probation* 18(1):5-6.
- MacNeil, Douglas H.
1954. Is vandalism actually on the increase? *Fed. Probation* 18(1):16.
- Madison, Arnold
1970. *Vandalism--the not-so-senseless crime.* Seabury Press, New York.
- Mannheim, Hermann
1954. The problem of vandalism in Great Britain. *Fed. Probation* 18(1):14-15.
- Martin, John M.
1959. The vandals: a study of malicious mischief. *Diss. Abstr. Int.* 20(10):59-6226.
- Matthews, Robert P.
1970. Thefts and vandalism in western Washington forests. *J. For.* 68(7):415-416.
- Miller, Alexander
1973. Vandalism and the architect. p. 96-111. *In* *Vandalism*, Colin Ward, editor Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.
- Murphy, Joseph P.
1954. The answer to vandalism may be found in the home. *Fed. Probation* 18(1):8-9.
- Neill, Shirley Boes
1975. Violence and vandalism. 80 p. *Natl. School Public Relat. Assoc.*, Arlington, Va.
- Palmer, John L. G.
1975. A study of the community education program as a deterrent of violence and vandalism in a small rural Michigan community. *Diss. Abstr. Int.* 36(06-a):3243-A.
- Perk, Richard A., and Howard Aldrich
1972. Patterns of vandalism during civil disorders as an indicator of selection to targets. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 37(5):533-547.
- Robarge, Margaret.
1965. Don't be a "wreckreator." *Recreation* 58(6):274-276.

- Schaeffer, E. B. (Mrs.)
1975. The roots of vandalism. Royal Soc. Health J. 95(2):79-82.
- Scott, Chester C.
1954. Vandalism and our present-day pattern of living. Fed. Probation 18(1):10-11.
- Smith, Donald Charles
1966. Vandalism in selected southern California school districts: nature, extent, and preventative measures. Diss. Abstr. Int. 27(05-A):1236-A.
- Spalding, Thomas L.
1971. Door hardware to check vandalism. School Manag. 15(10):30-31.
- Thomas, Gerald
1964. Chicago park district reduces vandalism. Parks and Recreation 47(Sept.):410-411.
- Von Kronenberger, G. R.
1976. Vandalism: a national dilemma. Elks Mag. 54(9):12-14, 20, 36, 55.
- Ward, Colin, editor
1973. Vandalism. 327 p. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.
- Weinmayer, Michael
1973. Vandalism by design--a critique. In Reflections In The Recreation and Park movement. David Gray, editor, Wm. C. Brown Co.
- Weiss, J. Norbert
1974. Vandalism: an environmental concern. NASSP [Nat'l. Assoc, Secondary School Principals] Bull. 58, p. 6-9.
- Wicker, Allen W.
1969. Attitudes vs. actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. J. Soc. Issues 35(4):41-78.
- Wilson, George T.
1964. Vandalism--how to stop it. Am. Inst. Park Executives Management Aids Bull. 7, 40 p.

